Cornell University Library

THE GIFT OF

General Library of the
University of Michigan

A. 249736 3/I/1911.

9755-I

Cornell University Library
PA 2025.M48
Latin philology.
3 1924 021 611 227
olin

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924021611227

University of Michigan Studies

HUMANISTIC SERIES

VOLUME III

LATIN PHILOLOGY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO, LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

LATIN PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

CLARENCE L. MEADER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1910

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1910
BY THE MACMILLAN CO.

The Lord Baltimore Press
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

PREFACE

The work of the Editor has been lightened by the painstaking of the contributors in preparing their manuscript for the printer; grateful acknowledgment is due also to Professors John C. Rolfe and Henry A. Sanders for helpful advice in the preparation of the third and fourth Studies.

The cost of publication of this volume was in part defrayed from a fund generously contributed by Mr. Franklin H. Walker, Mr. Theodore D. Buhl, Honorable Don M. Dickinson, Mr. D. M. Ferry, Mr. Charles L. Freer, Mr. James D. Hawkes, Col. Frank J. Hecker, Mr. J. L. Hudson, Mr. J. C. Hutchins, Mr. W. C. McMillan, Honorable T. W. Palmer, Mr. George H. Russel, Mr. Henry Russel, Mr. Walter S. Russel, Honorable T. C. Reilly, Mr. A. L. Stephens, Mr. Charles M. Swift, Mr. Charles B. Warren, and Honorable Peter White.

CLARENCE L. MEADER.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN,
October 24, 1910.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PART I. THE USAGE OF IDEM, IPSE AND WORDS OF RELATED MEANING. By *Clarence L. Meader.*

Preliminary Note 1

I. Latin Words expressing Identity..... 3

II. *Idem* as an anaphoric Pronoun; "adverbial" *idem*.. 62

Bibliography 105

PART II. A STUDY IN LATIN ABSTRACT SUBSTANTIVES. By *Manson A. Stewart.*

Introductory 113

I. Some supposed Evidence of a distinct vulgar Dialect. 116

II. Abstract Substantives as Characteristic of the popular Speech 124

III. Classes of Substantives said to be peculiar to certain Trades 126

IV. Classes of Substantives as characteristic of the popular Speech or the literary Language..... 128

V. Certain works as Sources for vulgar Vocabulary.... 151

VI. Plautus and Terence compared..... 154

Appendix 157

PART III. THE USE OF THE ADJECTIVE AS A SUBSTANTIVE IN THE DE RERUM NATURA OF LUCRETIUS. By *Frederick T. Swan.*

History of the Problem..... 179

Class A..... 186

Class B..... 202

PART IV. AUTOBIOGRAPHIC ELEMENTS IN LATIN INSCRIPTIONS. By *Henry H. Armstrong*..... 215

Appendix 269

GENERAL INDEX 287

THE USAGE OF *IDEM, IPSE* AND WORDS OF RELATED MEANING

The following pages form the continuation of the work begun by the writer in the book entitled The Latin Pronouns *Is, Hic, Iste, Ipse;* a Semasiological Study, published in 1901 (New York, The Macmillan Co.).[1] In the present paper, however, a somewhat different method has been followed than was employed in the book referred to. The lexicographical treatment that dominated in the earlier work has been made less prominent, and an effort has been made not merely to describe and exemplify by citations the various meanings of the Latin pronouns treated, but also to broaden the work somewhat by comparing the changes in the meanings of the Latin pronouns with those of synonymous and etymologically related words in Latin and in the other Indo-European languages. It is hoped that in this way some of the errors that necessarily attend the other point of view have been avoided.[2] In any case

[1] See also Archiv Lat. Lex. vol. 11 (1899), pp. 368-397; vol. 12 (1901-1902), pp. 239-254; 355-365; 474-477.

[2] It is much to be regretted that the tendency to extreme specialization has in recent years led many classical scholars so to neglect the study not only of the general principles of language but also of the languages related to that with which they are mainly concerned, that so eminent an authority as Professor Brugmann feels called upon to utter the following warning: "Schon jetzt liesse sich an vielen Stellen im Verfolge dieser Untersuchungen zeigen wie Specialisten bei Versuchen, Erscheinungen die die Demonstrative betreffen, historisch zu erklären, aus dem Grunde in die Irre gegangen sind, weil sie die grösseren Zusammenhänge, denen diese Erschein-

the parallels that will be adduced cannot fail to throw light upon the Latin usages, and are likely to be all the more instructive from the fact that in most instances they represent perfectly parallel, though entirely independent, shifts of meaning. Hence they should be made to appear in their real character, namely, as certain forms of mental activity which under similar conditions are similarly manifested in different languages.

The material presented in this paper has been distributed as follows: (I) After a brief description of the various forms of identity and related concepts, the shifting meanings of the Latin words symbolizing them will be discussed and attention will be called to the parallel usages of Sanskrit, Greek, Gothic, German and Old English,[1] but with less extensive use of Balto-Slavic, Celtic and Iranian material; then follows a discussion of certain uses of *Ipse;* thereafter (II) the change of *idem* from a pronoun of identity to a simple personal pronoun (chiefly anaphoric or relative), and lastly the development of *idem* into a "conjunction"—the so-called adverbial use—will be treated.

ungen angehören, zu wenig beachtet haben."—Die Demonstrativpronomina der indo-germanischen Sprachen, ein bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (= Abhandlungen d. Sächs. Gesells. d. Wiss. ph.-hist. Kl. vol. 22 [1904]), nr. 6, pp. 17 f. The paper has also been reprinted.

[1] i. e. Anglo-Saxon.

I. LATIN WORDS EXPRESSING IDENTITY

In this paper the word identity is used, consistent with the practice of recent writers on logic, to describe not a single concept, but a group of related concepts, which on the one hand stand in close relationship to the concept of oneness, and on the other hand pass by very gradual transitional stages into those of difference and disparateness. Of the three concepts that fall under the head of oneness, we are not immediately concerned with either the oneness of isolation illustrated by Plautus, Trin. 1114[1] *Sed hic unus, ut ego suspicor, seruat fidem,* or the oneness of unity exemplified in Celsus 7, 4, 4 (l. 14 D) *linum . . . . duplex triplexve, sic tortum, ut unitas facta sit,* but only with the third, the oneness of identity, since that coincides in part with the concept of sameness expressed by many of the words with which this paper deals. In general, identity is the consciousness that what have been conceived of as objects of two or more distinct acts of apperception have "flowed together" or fused more or less completely into one. This fusion is the result of the analysis and comparison of the two experiences, the mind measuring each by the standard of the other and determining what qualities are common to the two. The stage of the fusion, that is the degree of its completeness, depends upon the number and importance of the qualities or elements, which by the act of comparison are recognized as common to the two experiences. If the act of comparison establishes the iden-

[1] All citations follow the larger edition of Ritschl, Loewe, Goetz and Schoell.

tity of all the qualities of the two objects previously regarded as distinct, that is, not only the relatively permanent qualities, such as form, color, density, etc., but also what are ordinarily varying qualities, such as the activities and the location peculiar to the objects in space and time, the result is

(1) *complete* or *absolute identity,* also called *numerical identity.*[1]

This is the form of identity that stands in closest relationship with the "oneness of identity." The difference between them lies only in this, that in the latter the oneness resulting from the fusion of the experiences occupies a predominating place in the concept, while in the former the consciousness of their former (conceived) distinctness is clearer.

But the act of comparison, while taking cognizance of all the elements of the two experiences, may establish the identity of only a part of them.[2] We then obtain some form of partial identity. It is evident that these forms are practically unlimited in number, varying as widely as the qualities themselves of the objects vary. It will be sufficient in this connection to call attention to a few of the more clearly marked forms, that result in part from the

[1] The term 'numerical identity,' is to be distinguished from 'identity in number,' by which is meant that form of partial identity, which results from the recognition of the fact that each of the objects compared is made up of an equal number of like parts or elements; as when we say that two armies are equal, because each is made up of ten thousand men.

[2] We may, of course, take cognizance of only some of the qualities; that is, we may abstract from certain ones. In this case we have absolute identity, provided we recognize the identity of all the qualities that are present in consciousness.

comparison of certain groups of qualities, usually found in close association with each other in the normal mind. If, for example, the act of comparison establish the identity of all the qualities of the two or more experiences except their empirical definiteness, i. e. the specific position they occupy in the order of things,[1] we obtain

(2) *specific identity,* a form of partial identity illustrated by the English sentence "The *same* plants grow in the *same* soil and climate everywhere;" cf. Celsus, De medicina 4, 25 [18] (= p. 150, l. 31 D) *eaedem verbenae decoctae,* 'twigs of the same species of plant.' It is clear that this form of identity would seldom occur as a result of the comparison of objects the individuality of which is strongly characterized. In such cases even though the qualities of the objects, for example, the persons, compared be recognized as identical, they will still be felt as in a sense distinct. Just such a case is found in Cicero, De amicitia 80 *verus amicus . . . . est . . . . qui est tamquam alter idem,* where the identity and distinctness respectively are expressed by *idem* and *alter.* However, this usage of the pronoun of identity in other languages as well as Latin is of extremely common occurrence. It seems almost trite to say that the context in which a word stands is of great importance in determining its meaning, yet so often is this fact disregarded, because of our natural tendency to deal with words as *isolated* concepts rather than as inseparable elements of a sentence, that attention cannot be directed to it too frequently. In the present case especially the word which the pronoun of identity

[1] "Empirisch bestimmt ist ein Gegenstand des Bewustseins, so fern es einer bestimmten Stelle im Zusammenhang der objectiv wirklichen Welt, oder einem bestimmten Ausschnitt aus demselben zugehörig gedacht wird."—Lipps, Logik, p. 36, § 71.

modifies is an all important factor in determining its meaning. There is, namely, a large number of concepts in apperceiving which we may, and very often do, keep the generic rather than the individualistic qualities more clearly before the mind. Such are many concrete objects: plants, medicines (even more general *remedia*), wines meats, etc.; cf. Cic. Acad 2, 85 *dic mihi, Lysippus eodem aere, eadem temperatione, eodem caelo, †aqua, ceteris omnibus centum Alexandros eiusdem modi facere non posset?* So likewise conditions of health: *valetudo, morbus;* physical qualities: *species, forma, color, pulchritudo;* attendant circumstances, conditions, situation, Cic. De leg. *agr.* 2, 97: *ex summa egestate in eandem rerum abundantiam (i. e. qua veteres Campani) traducti non solum copia, verum etiam insolentia commovebuntur;* similarly used are *condicio, pacto, causa, disciplina, fama, honos,* Cic. De div. 1, 51 (Deci) *mors ita gloriosa fuit, ut eandem concupisceret filius;* states of mind: *amentia, prudentia, voluntas, mens* 'opinion,' *dolores;* traits of character: *benignitas, fides, virtus.* In some of these instances *idem* has been defined as equivalent to *eiusdem generis* 'the same kind of.' These two expressions, of course, only roughly represent the idea conveyed by *idem.*

If the act of comparison establish the identity of only the mass of the objects or of the number of their parts or the degrees of their qualities, we obtain that form of partial identity called

(3) *equality* (*aequus, ἰσός,* Skr. samás in its most common usage; Ger. *gleich* covers all three of the categories thus far described), which is only a particularly definite one of the many forms expressed by the Indo-European pronouns or adjectives of identity. *Aequalis* expresses still more specific forms. For our present purposes it will be sufficient to call attention to four further forms:

(4) identity of the actual ground (*Realgrund*) of results existing successively, exemplified by the well known formula *Seius fecit idemque probavit* (cf. Lipps, Logik § 217-219), or put in a more general form and in the terms of systematic grammar, the identity of the object to which two or more predicates (or attributes) are successively assigned (see further p. 69).

This essential ground is very commonly a *continuum*, that is to say, something, so few of the qualities of which change from time to time, that the changes are either not perceived or are disregarded and the thing is conceived as permanently the same. If a large number of qualities, or even a few especially characteristic qualities change, the sense of sameness may no longer be awakened, in which case some little analysis of the two or more supposedly different objects may be necessary to establish their nature as two stages of a *continuum* (commonly expressed in Latin by *idem semper*). A good example is

Cic. Pro Caecina 59 quod (sc. decretum de hominibus coactis armatisve[1]) etiamsi verbo differre videbitur, re tamen erit *unum* et in omnibus causis idem valebit in quibus una atque eadem perspicitur causa aequitatis.

(*Unum* represents the concept in question.)

The importance of this form of identity for the understanding of the development of the pronoun of identity into an anaphoric pronoun will be brought out in the latter part of this paper.

(5) identity of the actual ground of results that exist simultaneously, illustrated by Quintilian, Inst. 12, 1, 9 *non igitur umquam malus idem et perfectus orator,*

[1] Cicero's opponent in the suit has raised a question as to the meaning of the words *coactis* and *armatis*, maintaining that an absolutely literal interpretation shall be put upon them.

or affirmatively by Suetonius, Calig. 54 *Threx et auriga, idem cantor atque saltator,* and according to a very probable reading Cic. Ad fam. 9, 2, 1 *Caninius tuus idem et idem noster* || v. ll. *C. tuus eidem noster; C. t. idem n.* ||

It is evident that we may in such a case as this look at the relationship existing between the ground and the results either from the point of view of the former or of the latter. The first case is illustrated by the examples just quoted. The latter in its extreme forms is commonly represented by *communis,* and in English by *common, joint, mutual,* etc. The absence of any absolute distinction between these two points of view is clearly reflected in the use of *idem* and *unus.* The extreme cases of this latter type pass into

(6) the identity of a quality (attribute or predicate) associated with two or more objects, the converse of the two last mentioned forms. *Et ipse* not uncommonly expresses this form.

(7) the act of comparison establishes the identity of only one or at most a few qualities, and these ordinarily not the predominating ones.[1] Words that usually express this form are: similar, like, resemblance, *ähnlichkeit, similis, ut,* ὅμοιος, ὁμοιότης, Sanskrit *evám, ivá, yatha, upama.* In the case of these concepts the non-identical elements or qualities are kept so clearly before the mind as to prevent the two experiences from more than slightly "fusing." The category is a broad one, and almost countless words are found in the Indo-European languages expressing dif-

[1] The dominating or predominating elements are those which stand out more clearly and distinctly in consciousness than do the others.—See Wundt, Völkerpsychologie, vol. I, 2, chap. 8, III, 3; all references to this work are applicable to both editions.

ferent forms of it. They are usually binary compounds, one member of which expresses the general notion of identity, while the other symbolizes the particular quality or qualities concerned, e. g. synonymous, *gleichbedeutend,* coordinate, equivalent, etc., etc. Of such words the present paper is concerned only with those in the case of which the general notion of identity has come to dominate the concept while the other element has so sunk into the background that it is no longer felt, or, at least no longer distinctly felt, as a part of the word. Old English *gelīc,* for example, is commonly supposed to have meant originally 'co-bodied.'[1] Sanskrit *sadṛça* means etymologically 'of common appearance,' hence 'like,' *upamā* 'side-by-side measure,' hence 'simile' (the figure of rhetoric) and 'similar.' In proportion as the consciousness of the difficulty of bringing about a fusion of the two or more experiences becomes clearer and more dominating, this form of identity passes over into the concepts of difference and disparateness, just as at the other extreme absolute identity passes into oneness.

It should be borne in mind that the above described forms of identity are in no sense to be regarded as distinct categories sharply marked off from each other. On the contrary each type, as found in actual experience as an element of a unit of thought, contains elements of one or more of the others; and innumerable intermediate forms will be found between the various types described above. What appears as a predominating element in one will often appear as a non-predominating element in another. Under favorable conditions (that is, in the right kind of context)

[1] See Kluge, Ety. Wb. s. v. *gleich,* Uhlenbeck, Kz. ety. Wb. d. got. Spr. This etymology is questioned by Wood, Mod. Lang. Notes, vol. 21 (1906), pp. 39 f.

such an element may vary in relative prominence (as compared with the other elements of the concept) and the concept will thus gradually shift although still remaining associated with the same word. Accordingly we find in actual experience no sharp lines of differentiation between these forms, but only gradual transitions.

In Latin, as well as in the other Indo-European languages, we find the same word commonly expressing several forms of identity; *idem*, for example, expresses a variety of concepts. Very commonly, however, some one of the forms becomes more closely or more generally associated with a given word, the others occurring in association with it less frequently or even sporadically.

The forms just described are in no sense to be regarded as logical subsumptions, on the basis of which the shifts in meaning of words expressing identity are explainable. The student of language should, of course, direct his attention to the mental experiences which the words he is studying represent. So these types do not *explain* anything. They are intended merely to exhibit clearly certain ranges of usage within which the specific uses fall. The "why and wherefore" of shifts in meaning are to be found elsewhere; and we may here call attention to one fact which seems very materially to facilitate the changes of meaning within the types above described. Since all the concepts here discussed belong in the class of the so-called subjective judgments,[1] they do not necessarily reflect with exactness the relationship given us in the qualities themselves (so far as we may speak of such relationships as existing apart from our perception of them) of external objects, but are the product of the ordering activity of the mind, when

[1] See Lipps, Logik, § 185.

brought to bear upon those objects: not, of course, in the sense that the mind sets up arbitrary relationships. We make the order, but are aided by the sensations and make it upon the basis of them; whereas in the case of the objective judgment the mind simply observes, so to speak, and reports what it conceives to be the relations inherent in the external objects themselves. In contrast with this the near and remote demonstratives represent concepts that are based upon objective judgments (*this* and *that, hic* and *ille*). Accordingly they appear seldom or never to interchange functions.

One further general condition of language development may be mentioned here. Although so patent and obviously true that all must admit its existence and its effects on language, yet it is so commonly left unheeded that the attention of those who would study language development, cannot be too sharply directed to it.

When we compare two or more objects, especially when we compare them, as we do in ordinary experience, without any particularly strong effort of will and without protracted and detailed analysis, we usually perceive only a part of the qualities of the objects; and of those perceived not all are perceived with equal clearness and distinctness. Some stand out vividly and dominate the whole group. Others are neglected or even entirely disregarded. Still others occupy intermediate positions. Furthermore when the same objects are compared a second or third or *n*-th time, we do not perceive the same qualities that we perceived in the previous instances, nor with the same degree of clearness. This being true, still greater is the difference between the qualities which different persons perceive in the same objects, what they attend to and what they neglect being conditioned both by the situation of the moment and

by all their previous experiences. In other words, we ordinarily abstract from some qualities of the objects and so completely neglect them in favor of certain others, that these latter become to our minds the essential or even the sole qualities of the objects. From this point of view, that would be regarded as complete identity, which from the point of view of formal logic would be partial identity. In this paper the effort has continually been made to avoid taking into consideration any elements which the context did not warrant one in assuming to have actually entered into the mental experience of the writer at the time the word in question was used.

Taking up now the particular words denoting identity we may begin with Latin *unus,* the usage of which coincides to some extent with that of *idem.* No definite line of demarcation can be drawn between the concept of 'oneness of identity' and 'absolute identity.' At no point can we say, "here the one concept ends and the other begins." The fundamental difference between them lies merely in the degree in which the consciousness either of the former diversity conceived to exist between the compared objects or of the unity resulting from the fusion of the experiences dominates the concept.[1] In many cases it is therefore extremely difficult or even impossible to determine which concept a word in a given instance represents. Such a doubtful passage is Plautus, Amphitruo 850 *qui mecum una uectust* una *navi.* The idea of oneness is likely to be present with special clearness in those passages in which the concept represented by *unus* stands in close relationship with those expressed by *omnes, universi, frequens,* etc. There are a few very common phrases, such as *una voce, unum in locum,* which are frequently found in association with these three words. See, for example,

[1] See p. 4.

Cicero, Pro Balb. 12 *una voce omnes iudices ne id fieret reclamasse,* in which the element of unity clearly predominates. In cases of this class the idea expressed by *unus* stands in expressed or implied contrast with that of multiplicity. There are other cases, although they are far less numerous, in which the concept of *unus* stands in contrast with that of diversity, e. g. Cic. De off. 3, 83

Honestate igitur dirigenda utilitas est, et quidem sic, ut haec duo verbo inter se discrepare, re unum sonare videantur;

Virgil, Aen., 9, 182 f.

His (sc. Niso et Euryalo) amor unus erat, pariterque in bella ruebant:
Tum quoque communi portam statione tenebant. (This passage exemplifies form 6);

Virg. Geo. 2, 83-88

Praeterea genus haut unum nec fortibus ulmis
Nec salici lotoque neque Idaeis cyparissis,
Nec pingues unam in faciem nascuntur olivae,
. . . . || . . . . nec surculus idem
Crustumiis Syriisque piris gravibusque volaemis.
Non eadem arboribus pendet vindemia nostris
Quam Methymnaeo carpit de palmite Lesbos;

Horace, Ode 2, 11, 9-11

Non semper idem floribus est honor
Vernis neque uno Luna rubens nitet
Voltu;

Cic. Paradoxa 20 In quo peccatur, id potest aliud alio maius esse aut minus, ipsum quidem illud peccare, quoquo verteris, unum est.

In the last passage the predominance of the idea of "oneness" is excluded by the words *maius aut minus,*[1] while

[1] Compare this meaning of *unus* with that of simplex (derived from **sm̥* '1' and *plec-* 'fold') in such passages as Cic. De sen. 78 *cum simplex animi esset natura neque haberet in se quicquam admixtum dispar sui atque dissimile, non posse eum dividi,* i. e. 'homogeneous' 'of the same quality throughout,' while *unus* here means 'of the same qualities under all circumstances' (successive identity) 'unchanging.'

the meaning of two instances immediately preceding this is made clear by the correlation of *unus* with *idem.* Compare further Cic. Paradoxa 20 *extr.*

Id (i. e. *non licere*) si nec maius nec minus umquam fieri potest, quoniam in eo est peccatum, si non licuit, quod semper unum et idem est, quae ex eo peccata nascantur, aequalia sint oportet;
Nepos, Alc. 1, 4 idem . . . . luxuriosus, dissolutus, libidinosus, intemperans reperiebatur, ut omnes admirarentur, in uno homine tantam esse dissimilitudinem tamque diversam naturam;

Sallust, Jug. 79, 3 ager in medio harenosus, una specie;

Id. 85, 15 quamquam ego naturam unam et communem omnium existumo, sed fortissumum quemque generosissumum

So also in the phrase *una mente* (usually coupled with *una voce*) it is usually plain that qualitative identity was uppermost in the mind; cf. Cic. Phil. 4, 8 *u. m. unaque v. dubitare;* 8, 2 *universi u. m. atque u. v. . . . . conclamastis;* 7, 22 *populus . . . . u. m. a. u. v. . . . . vocavit.* In Cic. Pro Scauro 41 *una v. u. m.* is contrasted with *varietas* (§ 40); cf. De har. resp. 45. Side by side with the common phrase *unum et* (*atque*) *idem sentire* we find in Cic. Phil. 6, 18 *Unum sentitis omnes. Unus* appears to show this element of meaning in the word *unanimus* which differs from *una mente* mainly in the closer fusion of the two originally distinct concepts and in the relative importance of the concept of *unus.* So in Catullus 30, 1 *unanimis sodalibus;* 9, 4 *fratres unanimos* (cf. Stat. Theb. 8, 669); 66, 80 *unanimis coniugibus,* and in other authors. We also find quite commonly *unum et* (or *atque*) *idem, unum* alone and *idem* alone as the object of the verb of intellectual action *sentio,* e. g. Cic. In Catilinam 4, 14 *in qua omnes sentirent unum atque idem.* A comparison of the two passages Caesar, Bell. Gall. 5, 31, 2

facilem esse rem, seu maneant seu proficiscantur, si modo unum omnes sentiant ac probent;

Bell. Gall. 3, 23 non cunctandum existimavit, quin pugna decertaret. hac re ad consilium delata; ubi omnes idem sentire intellexit, posterum diem pugae constituit.

suggests a distinction between the two words. *Idem* is used when the concept to which as an "antecedent" it refers is a situation, fact or thing that has just previously been mentioned or which is to follow immediately after the *idem,* and to which *idem* looks forward. Otherwise *unus* is often used.

This distinction is also observed in the following German sentence: "Die Betonung des Pronomens ist wohl in allen Sprachen eine *Einheitliche* gewesen, so wie sie im . . . . durchgehends *dieselbe* ist."—Brugmann, Die Demonstrativpronomina p. 23. This distinction is doubtless based upon the fact that in *unus* the pronominal element *oi-* has entirely ceased to be a dominating part of the word, while with *idem* this is not the case. The distinction is not always strictly observed. We may perhaps say that there is a decided tendency of the two words to follow these two divergent lines. Section 18 of Cicero's sixth Philippic *unum sentitis omnes, unum studetis, M. Antoni conatus avertere a re publica, furorem extinguere, opprimere audaciam; idem volunt omnes ordines, eodem incumbunt municipia, coloniae, cuncta Italia* shows that *unus* occasionally approaches the usage of *idem,* in so far as there is an appositional phrase associated with it. It cannot, however, be said to "look forward" to this phrase as would *idem.* On the other hand there are sporadic cases in which *idem* has gone so far in its development as to serve the same function as *unus.* See, for example, Cic. Lael. 33 *incidere saepe ut de republica non idem sentiretur* (sc. ab amicis). In this instance all trace of an anaphoric element in *idem*

has disappeared. The usage is at least as old as Terence, Hecyra 199 *Utin omnes mulieres eadem aeque student nolintque omnia,* and doubtless considerably older.

The phrase *uno modo* also bears this force in Cic. De leg. 1, 47 quae aliis sic, aliis secus *nec eisdem semper uno modo videntur;* cf. De sen. 78 (quoted above), also De off. 2, 61; Timaeus 21.

This lack of any anaphoric element in *unus* and the consequent rarity of its uses as a correlative facilitates its association with form (5). In fact form (5) represents the prevailing usage of *unus* as an adjective or substantive of identity. It is its chief point of contact with *idem.* A particularly happy instance is Virgil's *His amor unus erat* cited above. In Caesar, Bell. Gall. 2, 3, 5 is found the especially striking passage

tantumque esse eorum omnium furorem, ut ne Suessiones quidem, fratres consanguineosque suos, qui eodem iure et eisdem legibus utantur, unum imperium unumque magistratum cum ipsis habeant, deterrere potuerint, quin cum his consentirent.

Observe that in this passage *unum* is correlated with *idem,* just as in Cic. Pro Sulla 5 it is correlated with *par: intelliges et de hoc et de aliis indicium meum et horum par atque unum fuisse.* In the last passage, however, neither the element of simultaneity nor of succession seems to play any important part. It is unessential and so it is less regarded.

In this category (5) belongs *par excellence* the phrase *eodem tempore* and especially the plural *eisdem temporibus,* this latter phrase being commonly used to indicate not merely the coincidence in time, but also the identity of situation or circumstances, under which different acts take place. It is significant that although *uno tempore* often

occurs (see, e. g. Nepos, Dat. 6, 8), the plural *unis temporibus* seems never to have been used. The plural of *unus*, while it ordinarily expressed isolation, is found, although rarely, as an expression of identity.

Conversely I am not able to cite a single passage in which *idem* means '1,' although there are passages in which the concept it represents is contrasted with the idea of multiplicity rather than of variety, and in which the idea of oneness rather than of identity may be read into the word.

The use of *unus* to express identity remained sporadic and confined to a few types of context, and a similar situation is found in other Indo-European languages. It appears, namely, that neither *unus* in the ancient Italic or the modern Romance languages nor its cognates in any other Indo-European language came to be used exclusively or even chiefly as a symbol of identity in any form whatever. The nearest approach to it is found in the secondary derivative *ähnlich*, which expresses exclusively form (7). That *ähnlich* is a derivative of **oinos* is shown according to Kluge, Etym. Wörterb. *s. v.* by the varying orthography *ain-, ein.* The word appears in the literature comparatively late (not earlier than the sixteenth century) and only in west middle Germany at first. In derivation therefore it is entirely parallel, but to all appearances entirely independent of Old English *ánlíc* (*ænlíc*), which, however, means 'alone' 'singular,' etc., and is a different word from *onlíc* (*anlíc*).[1] Latin *similis* is also parallel with *ähnlich* in derivation, if indeed the first element **sem* (**sm̥*) really meant '1.' The German word shows that it may have had that meaning, as does also Modern Persian *yaksān* 'gleich-

[1] This is related to Gothic *analeiko*, M. H. Ger. *analīch*, although Bosworth-Toller compare it with *ähnlich*.

artig' 'ähnlich,' which is compounded of *yak* (from Old Persian *aivaka,* itself related to Avestan *aēvo-, aēva-* 'unus'; cf. Geiger, Grundr. d. iran. Phil. I, 2, p. 113) and *sān,* older form **āsān*(?), perhaps related to Skr. çāsana (Andreas *apud* Geiger, op. cit. p. 96),[1] and meaning 'Art and Weise' (Geiger, p. 188). Gothic *samaleiko* can not be regarded as parallel to *similis* and *ähnlich,* since *sama-,* although it may have been derived from Indo-Eur. **sem,* had in all probability no trace of the meaning '1' in Gothic.

With *unus* are directly related both etymologically and in meaning Gk. ο νή, Gothic *ains,* Old Norse *eins,* Old Eng. *án* and perhaps Sanskrit *eka.* The Old English dictionary of Bosworth-Toller does not recognize the word *án* 'one' as having the force of the oneness of identity, except as it occurs in the genitive singular modifying a substantive. It cites (on p. 42) only one example *ánes hiwes* 'of the same hew' or 'shape,' giving no reference to the source.[2] In reading King Alfred's works, Aelfric's Lives of the Saints, Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica and Gregory's Pastoral I have not met with the usage. Old English possesses many compounds of *án,* but with a single exception (at least so far as we can judge from Bosworth-Toller) *án* bears in them the meaning of isolation (so *ánlíc* 'only,' *ánige* 'one eyed') or of unity (so *án-hraedlice* 'unanimous'). The last occurs rarely. The exception is *án-swége* 'having the same sound.' As it is quoted only from glosses (as is also the simple word *swége* and its other compound *ungeswége*), we are not in a position to judge its exact meaning. The usage occurs in Middle English,

[1] Cf., however, Hübschmann, Persische Studien, pp. 25, 170, 173.

[2] Compare the contrast in meaning between *ánlíc* and *ähnlich* just noted.

e. g. in Palladius, Spencer and Chaucer. Old High German shows it from the 10th and 11th centuries (Notker, Aristotle's Organon, etc.). In Old Norse it also occurs, for example in the Analecta Norraena occur within a few lines *einni ok hinni sömu tunge* (p. 256, l. 3) and *einar tungu* (p. 256, l. 7), the last phrase 'of the same tongue' being a descriptive genitive like *ánes hiwes* cited above. In Gothic the usage *unus* 'same' does not occur at all either in *ains* standing as a single word or in its compounds. In view of the scantiness of the extant Gothic literature great importance can scarcely be attached to this. Greek οἴνη is used only in the meaning 'ace.' Russian *odin* '1' (derived from **oinos?*)[1] is used much as the Latin *unus*, e. g. in the phrase *odno i tože* 'one and the same.'

From the material here collected it appears that the descendants of **oinos*, from which come nearly all the words meaning 'one' in the European languages of the Indo-European family, have shown only a restricted tendency to become associated with the concept of identity. It seems worth while to emphasize this fact, because the current notion is quite the contrary.

Turning to Sanskrit *eka*, which is compounded of the same element **oi* which is found in **oinos* and the formans *-ka*,[2] we note that it is used freely as a member of compound words to express identity, but less freely as a word by itself. Note the compounds *ekacitta* 'the same thought,' (cf. *samacitta* 'like minded'), *ekaduḥkha* (cf. *samaduḥka*) 'having the same affliction,' *ekajāta* 'from the same father,' (cf. *samānajāti* 'of the same kind'), *ekarūpa* (cf. *samanarūpa*) 'of like form,' *ekārtha* 'synonymous' (cf. *samārtha, samārthaka, samānārtha,* all meaning 'synony-

[1] Cf., however, Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gram. § 441.

[2] Cf. Walde, Etymol. lat. Wörterb. s. v. *unus*.

mous') *ekānārtha, ekayoni* and especially *ekavidha* 'similar.'

No doubt the widespread, and, as it appears to the writer, exaggerated notion, that words meaning 'one' easily pass over into the meaning 'same,' is based, in no small part, on the frequency with which such phrases as 'one and the same,' *unus et idem, unus idemque, unus atque idem, ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἓν καὶ ὅμοιον, ekasamānas, ein und derselbe,* etc., etc., occur in most languages. As a matter of fact these phrases, though of frequent occurrence, rather show the imperfect nature of the direct association of *unus, one,* etc., with the various forms of the concept of identity. Nor does the occurrence of these phrases necessarily mean that at the time of their occurrence the word or words ordinarily used to express identity were losing or had already lost their force in any given language.

Touching these points there are two facts worthy of note in the usage of these phrases. The first is the increased degree to which the feelings ordinarily predominate in them as compared with the relatively slight part which the feelings commonly (perhaps we may say ordinarily) play in the concepts symbolized by the words *idem, derselbe,* etc., when standing alone. The most important difference between the so-called re-inforced and the simple expressions lies in this and not in the greater degree in which the form of identity approaches that of complete identity. In this respect the above phrases are to some extent parallel with such expressions as *exactly similar,* etc.

The absence of fusion, or, as it might better be put, the absence of a strong tendency of the elements (both of word and meaning) of these phrases to enter into close fusion, is indicative of the absence of any strong tendency of *one, unus,* etc., to become closely and permanently associated with the concept of identity. It is true that the two prin-

cipal concepts of *unus et idem*, i. e. those represented by *unus* and *idem* respectively, did to a slight degree merge into each other. Different degrees of such fusion are represented by the following passages:

Tacitus, Ger. 24, 1 genus spectaculorum unum et in omni coetu idem;

Cic. Lael. 92 ne in uno quidem quoque *unus* animus erit idemque semper, sed varius, commutabilis, multiplex;

Cic. De div. 2, 97 haec requiro: omnesne, qui Cannensi pugna ceciderint, uno astro fuerint; exitus (i. e. mors) quidem omnium unus et idem fuit;

Cic. Timaeus 19 itaque una conversione atque eadem ipse (sc. mundus) circum se torquetur et vertitur;

Virgil, Aen. 12, 847

Quas et Tartaream nox intempesta Megaeram
Uno eodemque tulit partu; cf. Bucol. 8, 80 f.;

Horace, Epist. 2, 2, 200

Nave ferar magna an parva ferar unus et idem.

Although it is possible that the fusion went still further than this, the phrase does not appear to have gained any greater currency in late Latin than in the classical period. Examples seem, if anything, to appear less frequently. Certain it is, that the phrase never came into such general usage as to supplant *idem* and never even approximated the degree of fusion or the frequent usage that was reached in the case of *metipsimum* (French *mème*, Spanish *mismo*) and *istum ipsum* (Italian *stesso*).[1] The fusion of *ein und derselbe* appears to be going on but very slowly in German. The orthography *einunddersełbe* (so written by Paul in his Principien der Sprachgeschichte, 3d edition, and Sommer, Lat, Laut. u. Formenlehre) may be taken as indicative of a slight fusion, notwithstanding the arbi-

[1] See Latin Pronouns p. 184.

trary character of modern German orthography. A weakening of the emotional content of the phrase, which would tend in some degree to promote fusion, is exemplified by the sentence:

Der Umstand, dass das mittelalterliche Latein zu verschiedenen Zeiten ihren Wortschatz bereichert hat, ist bei ihnen (sc. den romanischen Sprachen) den abweichenden Entwicklungen eines und desselben Wortes besonders gunstig gewesen—Wundt Völkerpsych. I, 2, chap. 8, I, § 2 (p. 424, 1st ed.).

In modern English also the phrase shows little tendency to fuse, and points in the same general direction (as regards the relation of the descendants of **oinos* to the concept of identity) as does the all but complete absence in Old English of compounds containing *án* in the meaning 'same.' In both Latin and German similar compounds are either rare or in the great minority (cf. Latin *unanimus, unicolor, uninomius, uniformiter, unose*).

In the Asiatic group of the Indo-European languages we nowhere find **oinos* with the meaning 'one' in any of the three forms of isolation, unity or identity. It is used exclusively as a pronoun (substantive or adjective). In Sanskrit *enam, enām, enat* is used only as a substantive pronoun of the third person, 'him,' 'her,' 'it.' In modern Persian it appears as *īn* and means 'this' (near demonstrative). Its function in Gabri corresponds to that of the Sanskrit word. In other modern Iranian dialects it means 'this.'[1] The modern Persian *īn* goes directly back to middle Persian *in* (*en*?) 'this,' but the word does not occur in Avestan. In Armenian *ain* is used as a remote demonstrative ('that'). So long as de Saussure's view that primitive Indo-European possest a vowel *å* as well as *o* the identification of *ain* with **oinos* presented

[1] Geiger, Grundr. d. iran. Phil. I, 1, p. 139.

greater difficulties; but now that Pederson, Kuhn's Zeitschrift vol. 39 (1900), pp. 86 ff. has shown the untenability of the view advanced by de Saussure and now that Brugmann has abandoned it (see Kurze Vgl. Gram. p. 74, Anm.), the connection between *ain* and **oinos* may be fairly assumed. Such a development of **oinos* into a remote demonstrative in Armenian should serve to support the identification of Middle High German and Swiss *ein* 'that' (remote demonstrative) and Swiss (Basel) *d-ain* with **oinos*. We thus find the pronominal force preserved in three languages. But do not the familiar Latin expressions made up of *unus* or *unus omnium* and a superlative likewise in many cases show traces of an adjectival demonstrative force, which in the earlier periods of the Indo-European languages may have been much more general?

The early Indo-Europeans certainly made considerable use of a form of demonstration, the essential quality of which consisted in the direction of the attention sharply and intently upon an object, thus bringing it out distinctly from its surroundings. This form of demonstration was defined and used in interpreting the meaning of *iste* in the writer's Latin Pronouns (p. 156) and was later negatively defined by Brugmann, Die Demonstrativpronomina pp. 9, 20. On the basis of such a force the Latin expressions can be explained. Take Cic. Tusc. disp. 3, 34 *quae cogitatio una maxime molestias omnis extenuat et diluit,* 'This is *the* reflection that most relieves all annoyances;' 3, 81 *id genus aegritudinis, quod unum est omnium maximum,* 'the bitterest of all.' One must not confuse with this usage that discussed by Kühner, Lat. Gr. p. 314, Anm. 6, who cites as an illustration *unus vir praestantissimus,* 'einer der vorzüglichsten Männer, d. h. Ein Mann, nämlich der vorzüglichste.' In this usage, if Kühner's version

is correct, *unus* is indefinite; in the cases cited above it is definite. The assumption of this dér-demonstration (as it was named by Brugmann) for **oinos* explains equally well the use of *unus* with the comparative as in Horace, Epod. 12, 4:

> Namque sagacius unus odoror
> Quam canis acer ubi lateat sus.

Intermediate between this passage and the two from Cicero is that containing the quasi-superlative *magis omnibus* in Virgil. Aen. 1, 15:

> Quam (sc. Karthaginem) Iuno fertur terris magis omnibus unam
> Posthabita coluisse Samo.

The assumption of such a meaning for **oinos* is entirely consistent with its derivation, as far as that can be with reasonable certainty made out. *oi-* is a pronominal particle; *-no-* is clearly connected with a very ancient deictic particle seen in Sanskrit *hi-na* (also Vedic *na*), Greek νή (νὴ Δία), Lat *ne* (nē ille, etc.), *nem-pe, hoci-ne,* as also in Slavonic and Icelandic (see Persen Idg. Forsch. 2, pp. 199 ff.). The two elements yield for **oinos* the force 'just he,' 'he, see!' or 'just that' (not, however, with special connotation of remoteness). The general dér-demonstration became associated in different types of context with the meanings (1) 'one' (numeral, "oneness of isolation" especially and then the "oneness of unity"),[1] represented by ηνῐο, *unus,* Gothic *ains,* Irish *oin,* Old Bulgarian *inz;* (2) remote demonstration, represented by Armenian *ain,* Middle High German and Swiss *ein* 'jener'; (3) near demonstration, in Middle and Modern Persian *īn* 'this'; (4) 'same' rarely and perhaps secondarily; (5) anaphoric pronoun, the result of a weakening of the deictic force,

[1] For this development of meaning see p. 30 below.

in Skr. *enam, enām, enat,* used as a substantive, but bearing in its usage traces that point to a pre-Vedic adjectival (demonstrative) force. The development of the dér-demonstration into Mid. High German and Swiss *ein* 'jener' and Armenian *ain* is paralleled by that of **so-* and **to-* with original dér-demonstration into Russian *totъ, ta, to,* ordinarily used as a remote demonstrative and into Gothic *sa, so, þata;* the development of **oinos* into modern Persian *īn* 'this' (near demonstrative) is duplicated in the development of the same **to-* into Polish *ten, ta, to* 'this'; while its change to Sanskrit *enam,* etc., corresponds to that of **so* to early Latin *sos, sōs, sum, sam,* etc. From the point of view of the shifts in meaning involved no objection can be made therefore to bringing the Armenian word into connection with the Middle German one. Summary:

**oinos* dér-demonstration.	remained '*the*' (slightly modified) in Latin. > 'this' in Persian. > 'that' in Armenian, M. H. Ger. and Swiss > 'other' in Slavonic. > 'same' throughout most of Europe. > '1' throughout Europe > 'one,' indef. pronoun and indef. article. > 'he, she, it,' in Sanskrit.

For the relationship between 'that' (remote demonstrative) and 'other' see Brugmann, Demonstrativpronomina, pp. 82 (§ 33), 97 and particularly 106 ff. (§ 44).

The element *oi-* contained in *unus* recurs with the suffix *-u̯o* in Skr. *evā́, evā́, evám* 'likewise' and Avestan *aéva* 'so' 'thus' and *aēva* '1.' *Eva* and *aēva* 'so' have the appearance of being a stereotyped 'casus indefinitus'[1] (cf., however, Zubaty, Idg. Forsch. vol. 3 (1894), p. 127). In Gk. likewise the normal ablaut grade of the first syllable

[1] On the 'casus indefinitus' see Hirt, Idg. Forsch. vol. 17 (1904-05), pp. 36 ff.

is preserved in οἶος (for οιϝος). Οἶος is confined to the expression of the concept of isolation (cf. Old Engl. *ánlík*). Irish *ai, ae* '1,' if it is related to οἶος (which appears to be very doubtful), shows how widespread (geographically) was the association of this word with 'oneness,' and also shows the same absence of close association with the concept of identity which we noticed in the case of *unus* and its congeners. In like manner the word ἰός (Homeric and Cretan) and ἴα (Homeric, Lesbian and Thessalian), which show the weak grade of the first syllable (like Skr. *ivá*), shows only slight association with the concept of identity. Buck, in his note on Cretan ἴος (Class. Phil. vol. 1 (1906), pp. 409-411), is clearly right in his reassertion of Dareste and Harassoulier's interpretation of the word as a slightly attenuated demonstrative (traces of which meaning we have attempted to show in *unus* above). In Homer the usage is very restricted and the word has the appearance of having become obsolete except in a few more or less conventional (and probably very old) phrases. For example, Iliad 4, 437

Οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμὸς θρόος οὐδ' ἴα γῆρυς,
Ἀλλὰ γλῶσσ' ἐμέμικτο πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες ;

13,354 Ἦμὰν ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμὸν γένος ἠδ' ἴα πάτρη,
Ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς πρότερος γεγόνει καὶ πλείονα ᾔδη

we note a stereotyped phrase in which ἴα approaches the force of '*communis*'—type (5)—(which is the most commonly used force of ὁμός). In 16,173 Τῆς μὲν ἰῆς στιχός ἦρχε Μενέσθιος (then follow τῆς ἑτέρης, τριτῆς, τετάρτης and πεμπτῆς) it is serial, and Od. 14,435

Τὴν μὲν ἴαν (sc. one piece of the slaughtered boar) νύμφῃσι καὶ Ἑρμῇ, Μαιάδος υἱεῖ,
Θῆκεν ἐπευξάμενος, τὰς δ' ἄλλας νεῖμεν ἑκάστῳ,

its force borders close on that of a personal pronoun of the

third person. The same meaning occurs in Iliad 11,174. The 'oneness of isolation' is represented in Iliad 21,569. The remaining examples are of one and the same class and all fall into type (5), showing accordingly the same point of contact between oneness and identity that we noticed in the case of *unus* and related words: Iliad 24,496

Ἐννεακαίδεκα (sc. παῖδες) μέν μοι ἰῇς ἐκ νηδύος ἦσαν;

6,422 Οἱ μὲν πάντες (i. e. Andromache's brothers) ἰῷ κίον ἤματι Ἄϊδος εἴσω;

9,319 Ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι, καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι·
Ἐν δὲ ἰῇ τιμῇ ἡμὲν κακὸς ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλός·
Κἀτθαν' ὁμῶς ὅ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ὅτε πολλὰ ἐοργώς;

(Note the correspondences ἴση, ἰῇ and ὁμῶς.)

22,477 Ἕκτορ, ἐγὼ δύστηνος· ἰῇ ἄρα γεινόμεθ' αἴσῃ
Ἀμφότεροι;

18,251 Ἰῇ δ'ἐν νυκτὶ γενοντο (sc. Hector and Polydamas).

The connection of Old Irish *ai, ae* with **oiu̯o-*[1] is too problematical to justify the discussion of the word in this connection.

From the extensive use of the descendants of **oiu̯o-* as a numeral in the European languages it is clear that toward the end of the pro-ethnic period the word had come into quite general use in this meaning, while the rather limited use in this meaning of the base commonly given in the form **sem* (it occurs as a distinct word meaning 'one'—the numeral—only in Greek εἷς, μία, ἕν and Armenian *mi*) along with its retention in Sanskrit, Iranian and Latin only in compounds like *sa-hasra, sa-kərət* and mīlle,[2] may be taken as fair indications that **oino-, *oiu̯o-* and **a*iko-* had, in some dialects at least, largely supplanted earlier **sem.*

From what has been pointed out above concerning the etymology and later development of the word **oinos* (from

[1] See Stokes, Sprachschatz, p. 3. [2] From **smī-gheslī.*

oi + *no-*), **oi̯uos* (from *oi* + *u̯o-*) and *eka* (from *a*i* + *ko-*), there can be nothing surprising in the suggestion that **sem* '1' and **somos* 'same' are derivatives of the pronominal stem **s°/e.*[1]

Although the *formans -mo-* is of quite frequent occurrence in the Indo-European languages, and was no doubt a productive suffix in the pro-ethnic period, it appears nowhere to have been associated with pronominal elements, unless of course, we assume that it occurs in **so-mo-s.* Now there was in use among the Oscans a suffix *-(d)um,* found in the words *ís-í-dum* (ειϲειδομ), *'īdem'* nom. sg., *íússu,* nom. pl., *ekkum,* adv., which express identity. Umbrian *-hon-t, -hon*[2] in *erihont, erarunt,* etc., is doubtless **hom* <**ho-m*) containing the same *-m-.* This is the *-em* of *idem* (<**id-m,* not **id-dem*).[3]

The Oscan and Umbrian words and *idem* appear to have meant originally something like 'precisely that' 'precisely this' (the two words *that* and *this* not implying remoteness or nearness respectively). Compare the development of *i-pse* into a pronoun of identity, the corresponding force of Skr. *sa eva* and Russian *to-že.* In the light of these words the archaic Latin *em-em* finds a reasonable explanation (so far as its meaning is concerned) as an accusative *im, em* plus this deictic particle *m.* This explanation appears to be better substantiated semasiologically than

[1] That there is a connection of some sort between these three words has often been assumed.

[2] v. Planta, Gram. II, p. 467.

[3] On the etymology of *idem* see Walde, Etymol. lat. Wörterb. s. v.; Stolz u. Schmalz, Lat. Gram. 3d ed., p. 138, Anm. 3. On *-dom* (or *-om*) and *-hon-t* see also Buck, A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, p. 147. On this *-m* in general see Leskien, Berichte d. Sächs. Gesell. d. Wlss., 1884, pp. 94 ff. Köhler, Archiv. Lat. Lex. vol. 8 (1893), pp. 228 ff.

the assumption of a doubled *em*. At least, the writer does not know of any cases in which the gemination of a pronoun has resulted in a pronoun of identity. *Idem, sa eva* and *to-že* are paralleled by a Telugu usage, in which the expression "The same man that I saw yesterday" would take a form corresponding to the English words "I the man yesterday seeing, *just that one.*" This *m* need not be identified with that in Skr. *sam* 'with,' *sa* (<*$s\underset{o}{m}$) 'with' or Gk. *ἁ-* (<*$s\underset{o}{m}$) which are perhaps a stereotyped case form of **so, sā*. The **som* thus resulting from the stem **so-* and the deictic particle *m* subsequently took on the inflection of *o-* and *ā-* stems after the manner of Latin *eapse* > *eapsa* > *ipsa*, giving **somos, *soma, *somom*.

With this particle may also be identified the final element of Skr. *ahám* 'I' (Greek *ἐγών*), *tvám* 'thou,' *vayám* 'we,' *yuyám* 'you,' *avā́m* 'we two,' *yuvā́m* 'you two,' *máhyam* 'to me' (*mahy-* = *mihi*) *má-m-a* 'of me,' etc.; naturally also *idám*.

It is, of course, impossible to assign with certainty each one of the words belonging to the large "*sem*-family" to a specific form of the base because of such ambiguities as Latin *em* = Indo-Eur. *em* or $\underset{o}{m}$, Skr. *sam* or *sa* and Gk. *ἀν* or *ἁ* = Indo-Eur. $\underset{o}{m}$.

(1) To $s\underset{o}{m}$, the accentless (weak) form of **sem* may be assigned Skr. *sa-kṛt* 'once,' i. e. 'a single time,' *sa-hasra* 'one thousand,' Avestan *ha-kərət* (= Skr. sakṛt), *ἅ-παξ* 'once for all,' *ἑ-κατόν* (<*ἁ-κατόν* under the influence of *ἕν, ἑνός*, etc.) 'one hundred.'

(2) To *sma*[x] are assignable *μία*(<*σμία*[1]) nom. fem. '1,'

[1] On the initial *σ* compare Brugmann's observation that the occurrence of the dative and genitives *ἰῇ* and *ἰῆς* in the Homeric poems and the (complete?) absence of *μιῇ, μιῆς* was due to the impossibility of utilizing the forms *μμιῇ* and *μμιῆς* in the hexameter verse (Kurze Vgl. Gram. § 441, note 1).

Latin *mīlle* for **smī-ghzlī* (containing the weak form of **gheslo* = χίλιοι, *Lesbian* χέλλιοι, Skr. *sa-hasra;* see Sommer, Lat. Laut-. u. Formenlehre, p. 500) and Armenian *mi* (Hübschmann, Armenische Gram. I, p. 474) '1.' The meaning of all these words may well have developed in the manner suggested by Brugmann in explanation of the derivation of the idea of 'oneness' from that of "dér-demonstration."[1] There appears to be no objection either from the point of view of the phonology or of the meaning to identifying this *sma*^{x} with the Sanskrit emphasizing particle *sma* ("casus indefinitus"), the meaning of which is very close to that postulated above for *sem* (cf. also Latin *quĭdem*). With Skr. *sma* goes the element *-sm-* found in the Sanskrit forms *asmắn, asmắbhis,* etc. (oblique cases of *vayám*), *yusmắn, yusmắbhis,* etc. (oblique cases of *yuvám*); Lesbian ἄμμε (<*ἀσμε) and ὔμμε; Umbrian *esmei* (Skr. *asmắi*); *puṣme;* Skr. *tasmāi* (cf. old Prussian *s-tesmu*), *tasmāt, tasmin* (= Gothic *þamma*), *amúṣmāi, amúsmāt; kasmāi* (cf. old Prussian *kasmu*), and other pronominal forms.

(3) To *sem* (normal grade): εἷς, ἕν. Derivatives: Gothic *simle* 'einst' 'ποτε', Latin *semel* 'a single time.' The derivation from *se-* and *mel* (= Gothic *mel* 'Zeit') appears to postulate a *se-* which finds but scanty support in the Greek alone. For the relation between the meanings of *semel* and *simle* compare English *once* meaning both 'once upon a time' and 'a single time.' Also *simplex, simplus, singuli, semper, singilio* and *sincinio,* all of which may, of course, represent *sm̥.*

[1] "Der energischere Hinweis auf einen Gegenstand .... dient dazu, ihn gegenüber anderen Gegenständen zu isolieren. .... Ist der Gegensatz zahlenmässig fixiert, z. B. *ich will dás* (*nur das*), *nicht zwei von dieser sorte,* so tritt beim Züruckweichen des Bedeutungselements des Deiktischen der Zahlbegriff '*unus*' heraus."—Demonstrativpronomina p. 109.

(4) To *sm̥mo-* (or *se̥mo-*) are assignable Skr. *samas* (accentless), *τις* 'quivis,' Gothic *sums* 'irgend einer,' 'jemand,' *suman* 'einst,' Icelandic *sumr*, mod. Engl. *some* (plural form of the indefinite article). Secondary derivatives: old Irish *samail* and *cossmail* (< **samalis* and **cossamalis;* cf. Latin *consimilis*) 'like' and a number of other Celtic words going back to *samali-* (see Stokes, Sprachschatz p. 293 f.); Latin *similis*. For the meaning of *samail* and *similis* "one-ish" cf. Ger. *ähnlich*, Persian *yaksam* (see above p. 17). Also Latin *simul, simitu* (= ? Irish *set* < *sm̥t* — Stokes l. c.);

(5) To *sm̥mo-* (or *sm̥o-*): *ἅμα, ἁμᾶ, *ἁμος*

(6) To **som-* or **somo-:* Skr. *samás* 'same,' 'equal,' *samam* 'plain,' i. e. 'campus,' Gk. *ὅμος* 'same,' Irish *som* 'self,' Gothic *sama* 'same' (old Norse, Icelandic *samr*), Russian *samŭ* 'self,' *samyĭ* 'same.' Derivatives: Skr. *samāna* 'same,' *ὁμαλός* 'level,' Umbrian *sumel* (?) (cf. Buck, Gram. of Osc. and Umbr. § 86, 3).

It is worthy of note that the notion of complete identity is associated chiefly, if not exclusively, with those words which represent the normal grade of the base in the *o-* form, i. e. those given in the last group. Of the words expressing partial identity occurring under the weak form *sm̥mo-*, Celtic **samalis* and Latin *similis* are made with the suffix *-lo-, -li-*, which forms words indicating something as having the quality signified by the base. The two words may therefore mean either "that-ish" or "one-ish." Greek *ὁμαλός* may be thought of as **ἁμαλός* (< **sm̥m-lós;* cf. *ἅμα* and *ἁμᾶ* with the initial vowel modified under the influence of *ὁμός*). The suffix *-lo-* seems regularly to have borne the word accent (see Hirt, Der indo-germ. Akzent p. 279).

One of the most striking elements of the concept of the "dér-demonstration" is that of isolation. This form

of demonstration is found in its most intense form in association with ideas that are apperceived[1] with unusual clearness and distinctness, i. e. those that especially absorb the attention. Concomitant with this isolation is the element of contrast. These two elements are the most constant and usually the most prominent elements in the meaning of the so-called intensive pronoun English *myself, yourself,* etc. (when not used as reflexives), German *Er hat selbst getan,* Latin *ipse.* Irish *som* 'self' and old Bulg. and Russian *samъ* 'self' are therefore semasiologically but very slightly removed from the form **som* assumed above. So also Skr. *simás* 'self,' which clearly belongs to *samás,* but in which the vowel *i* is difficult of explanation.

The words corresponding to the base in the form **somos* and expressing the general notion of identity show a great variety of shades in meaning.

Sanskrit *samás* has predominatingly the meaning of equality in Atharva Veda 2, 11, 1 *āpnuhi çreyaṅsam, ati samam krama* '(spoiler's spoil art thou; missil's missil art thou; weapon's weapon art thou:) attain the better one, step beyond the equal'; Nala 1, 27 *açvinoḥ sadṛço rūpe na samās tasya mānuṣāḥ* 'Like the Ashvins (is) Nala in form, (there are) not men his equal.'[2] Similarly *asamas* 'unequalled' in Atharva Veda 12, 3, 38 *uruḥ prathatām asamaḥ svargaḥ* 'Let the broad *peerless*[3] heavenly world spread itself out,' and *niṣamas* 'unequal, uneven, unfitting, common, bad.' A specialization of the meaning lies in Atharva Veda 8, 7, 17 *parvateṣu sameṣuca* 'on mountains and on plains.' This last development of meaning, which

[1] In the sense which the word bears in Wundt's writings.

[2] Or 'his like'? The two phrases are scarcely to be distinguished.

[3] So Miller, Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 42.

is clearly secondary, is perfectly paralleled by Latin *aequus* in the neuter singular in the phrase *in aequum descendere, in aequo confligere,* etc. Kathāsaritsagara 7, 88, 10 *dadāmi anyam maṁsam etad-samam tava* 'I shall give you other meat equal (in quantity) to this' is a particularly clear case of form (3). Form (7) is exemplified in Mānavadarmacāstra 4, 241 *mṛtam çariram utsṛjya kaṣṭaloṣṭa-samam* 'abandoning the body (which is) like a log or clod.' Rig V. 10, 117, 11 illustrates forms (4) and (5) *samāu cid hastāu na samam vivistas* 'the same hands do not accomplish the same things.'

I am not able to cite any Sanskrit passage in which *samás* expresses complete identity. This concept is expressed by *samānás,* a secondary derivative of *samás,* in which the latter is "reinforced" by the pronominal (?) element *ana* (in *anéna, anáyā*), and *ekasamānás.* The tertiary derivative *samanya* has the meaning of Latin *communis.* The antiquity of the meaning of *samás* is shown by Avestan *hamo* in the same sense.

In Gothic *sama* expresses complete identity and commonly translates ὁ αὐτός. The most valuable passage in the extant Gothic texts is Ephesians 6, 9. The Greek text reads καὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ὑμῶν ὁ Κύριος ἐστιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς, which the revised English version treats quite exactly 'both your master and theirs is in heaven.' In the Gothic version, however, the translator while faithfully preserving the general meaning, has translated somewhat freely ' *jah izwis sama frauja ist in himinam.*' There is no possibility that *sama* has here taken a coloring from the Greek idiom; it must represent a genuine Gothic usage. It is a very close approach to the unity of identity and, in fact, *sama* is occasionally used to translate Greek εἷς as in Mark 10, 8

καὶ ἔσονται δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν, '*jah sijaina þo tua du leika samin.*'[1]

The word occurs also in the northern branch of the Teutonic group, as in old Icelandic *samr;* but nowhere in the western branch, either as adjective or substantive, except in English into which it appears to have been introduced in the Middle English period from the Norse.[2] As is well known, it appears in literature for the first time in the Ormulum, l. 9914 (White and Holt) and only once in the long poem. In that passage it expresses complete identity and it has continued to express that concept until the present time. But it is not exclusively so used. An example has already been cited in which it expresses form (2) (see above p. 5).

It has been said that the frequent use of the reinforced expressions 'the self same,' 'the very same,' 'precisely the same,' 'exactly the same,' 'the self same identicle,' and others like them, are to be taken as an indication of a loss of force on the part of the word same. It is to be noted, however, that these expressions are confined for the most part to conversation in which there is almost invariably an active play of feeling. An examination of a large number of instances would probably show that these reinforced expressions are quite as much due to emotional tone of the expression as to the more objective elements of the concept. The corresponding reinforced expressions in Latin are largely found in those forms of literature, e. g. orations, in which the emotional tone is strong.

[1] There are but scanty traces of the use of *þata sama* as a determinative pronoun.

[2] See Reitzenfeldt, Der Gebrauch d. Pron. Artikels u. Verb. bei Thomas Kyd (Diss. Kiel, 1889) p. 28 "*The same* ist aus dem gleich bedeutenden altnd. '*enn same*' entstanden." Brate, Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum (Diss. Upsala, 1884) does not mention the word.

Greek ὁμός is the exact etymological equivalent of the words just cited. Even in the classical period of Greek history it had become obsolete in nearly all dialects and was almost entirely confined to epic poetry. Even here it occurs chiefly in the Homeric poems. Its range of meaning is also very narrow, it being confined to sub-varieties of type (5):

Odyssey 10, 41 ἡμεῖς δ' αὖτε ὁμὴν ὁδὸν ἐκτελέσαντες οἴκαδε νισσόμεθα;

Il. 13, 333 τῶν δ' ὁμὸν ἵστατο νεῖκος ἐπὶ πρύμνῃσι νέεσσιν;

Il. 23, 91 ὣς δὲ καὶ ὀστέα νῶϊν ὁμὴ σορὸς ἀμφικαλύπτοι.

For Il. 4, 437 and 13, 350 see above p. 26.

Although all but obsolete as a distinct inflected word its stem ὁμο- was a productive prefix in very general use. Its meaning, however, is also very narrow, it being confined to the same category with ὁμός. Out of about two hundred and fifty existing compounds of ὁμο- only two ὁμόκλαρος (Pindar Ol. 2, 89 and Nem. 9, 11) and ὁμόκραιρος (Nonnos, Dion 1, 336) are said to imply for ὁμο- a different meaning than 'common,' 'joint,' the versions 'having an *equal* share' and 'with *equal horns*' being given by Liddell and Scott for these two words respectively. But an examination of the passages in Pindar shows, that in the Nemean ode the word ὁμόκλαρος, referring to Apollo and Diana and being roughly translatable by '*consortes*,' means 'those who are born into a like or common lot in life,' while in the Olympian ode Pindar in calling the brother of Theron ὁμόκλαρον means merely that he had received the same kind of an honor, i. e. a common honor, with Theron. Theron had won a chariot race at Olympia while his brother had won at Nemea and in the Pythian games. Theron's brother was therefore ὁμόκλαρον 'with a common allotment of honor.' The passage in Nonnos also shows that ὁμόκραιρος

did not mean 'having equal horns' but 'likewise having horns.'

The Greek vocabulary was somewhat enriched by the secondary derivative of this word ὅμοιος, common in Greek of all periods. Its prevailing meaning is that of mere similarity, resemblance, and it shows only this meaning and that of equality in compounds of which it forms the first member. But it also, though seldom, expresses (a) complete identity—form (1)—as in Odyssey 16, 182

Ἀλλοῖός μοι, ξεῖνε, φάνης νέον ἠὲ πάροιθεν,
Ἄλλα δὲ εἵματ' ἔχεις, καί τοι χρὼς οὐχέθ' ὁμοῖος;

(b) the same meaning with ὁμός, e. g. Iliad 18, 329

Ἄμφω γὰρ πέπρωται ὁμοίαν γαῖαν ἐρεῦσαι;

(c) the idea of a *continuum* is clearly brought out in Antiphon περὶ τοῦ Ἡρῴδου φόνου 76 (= p. 138, 19);

(d) equality, e. g. Iliad 23, 632; Herodotus 9, 96 βουλευομένοισι γάρ σφι ἐδόκεε ναυμαχίην μὴ ποιέεσθαι· οὐ γὰρ ὧν ἐδόκεον ὁμοῖοι εἶναι, i. e. 'a match for them';

(e) identity of the result springing from two or more grounds, as in Thucydides 2, 89 ἡσσωμένων δὲ ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν οἱ γνῶμαι πρὸς τοὺς ἀντοὺς κινδύνους ὁμοῖαι εἶναι. Ὅμοιος is thus seen to cover nearly the whole range of the concepts of identity. The Greek vocabulary of identity was still further enriched by a tertiary derivative of ὁμός, namely παρόμοιος, which when corresponding to ὅμοιος in form (7) intensified ὅμοιος yielding the idea 'very like,' 'closely resembling' (just as *consimilis* intensified *similis* and perhaps as *galeiko* intensified *leiko*), but when corresponding to ὅμοιος in form (3), conveyed a less complete identity making from ὅμοιος 'equal' and from παρόμοιος 'nearly equal.'

It appears that the old ὁμός, if it ever had a wider range of meaning than that above described had given place to

ὅμοιος expressing primarily category (7), to ἴσος expressing equality, ὁμαλός, expressing the idea of 'evenness,' 'level' and ὁ ὀυτός expressing complete identity.

Those languages which have lost **somos,* or perhaps we should say more cautiously, do not now possess the word, employ in its stead words of comparatively late origin, or words which are found expressing identity in only that language. So Latin *idem,* which is not shared even by the Oscan-Umbrian group. German *derselbe* is confined to the Teutonic group, for even though it be related to Celtic **selva,* its meaning is entirely distinct. A cognate of *gleich* is found possibly in Baltic, although Uhlenbeck refuses to accept this connection. In Russian *tótъ že sámyĭ* 'same' is certainly much younger than *sámyĭ; podobnyĭ* must be a comparatively young compound, although the meaning 'fitting' seems to be very old; *rávnyĭ* is exclusively Balto-Slavic. Greek ἴκελος 'like' and ἴσος 'equal' are confined to the Hellenic branch as is also ὁ αὐτός. In Sanskrit and Iranian **somos* is practically confined to the expression of equality; in Greek to that of 'community,' Irish and Russian know it as an intensive, in Gothic, North Teutonic and English it expresses complete identity, and these two languages are the only living representatives of the Indo-Germanic family in which it has continued to be the most usual form for the expression of identity. In Latin and Celtic it is represented in this sense only by its secondary derivative *similis* and *samali-* both expressing 'resemblance.'

We have already seen that the derivation here suggested for **samos,* namely the demonstrative **so* plus the intensive particle *m* finds a direct semasiological parallel in Latin *idem* and *emem,* Oscan *isidum,* Umbrian *erihont,* Russian *tótъ že,* Sanskrit *sa eva,* and Telugu *āyana.* To these should be added Latin *ipse.*

This word is commonly known as an intensive pronoun, and while ordinarily translated by 'himself,' 'herself,' etc., it has not so wide a range of meaning as these English words nor the corresponding German *selbst*. The most characteristic and permanent elements in the concept associated with *ipse* as used in the so-called classical period are: (1) a strong deictic force, implying that the "antecedent" of *ipse* stands out with especial clearness, that is to say, occupies a dominating place in the sentence. (2) In consequence of this it is isolated from surrounding and related concepts, to such a degree that (3) it stands in sharp contrast with them. (4) It is not usually between the antecedent and his surroundings in general that this contrast is felt. *Ipse* does not, for example, in its ordinary usage contrast one man with all other men, but primarily only with those who are in some way naturally related with him. So *ipse* is the father as contrasted with his children, the master as contrasted with his slaves, the teacher as contrasted with his pupils, and so on. It is in the specific nature of the implied contrast that *ipse* differs from the modern words for 'self.' Of these four elements of meaning the first two and to some extent the third are also found in every pronoun having the dér-demonstration. It is clear that *ipse* goes back to a word having this form of demonstration, and we are therefore not called upon to select one from the four proposed derivations,[1] since all find either *i-* or *so-*, both dér-deictic pronouns, in the word.

It is well known that the pronoun *ipse* was extensively used in late Latin to express the concept of identity (see

[1] *is-pse* (Kretschmer, Deutsche Litt. Zeitung vol. 15 (1894), p. 70 f.); *i-p-so* (p < pe in *nem-pe*—cf. *quis-p-iam*—: Netusil. Archiv. Lat. Lex. 7 (1892), 579 f.; Lindsay, Latin Language p. 430); *e-pi-so* (Prellwitz, Etymol. Wörterb. d. griech. Sprache p. 97); *ep-so* (Danielsson *apud* Pauli, Altital Studien 3, 54).

Lat. Pron. chap. 4, pp. 165-190). It has been generally assumed—and it was assumed, though no where explicitly stated, by the writer in the work just mentioned—that the idea of identity developed out of that of "selfness" as expressed by *ipse*, i. e. including the element (4) described above. It would appear, however, that the idea of identity found so frequently in association with *ipse* in the later period, is really more closely related to certain other usages of *ipse* into which this element does not enter. Take, for example, Terence, Haut. 663

> CHR. Nomen mulieris cedo quid sit, ut quaeratur. So. Philtera.
>
> SYR. Ipsast. Mirum ni illa (i. e. the child) saluast et ego pereo.

The element (1) is here the prominent one (2), (3) being only side lights, so to speak, and (4) being entirely absent. Instead of the last we find (as the general context implies) that this person who alone absorbs the attention of Syrus, belonged to the old experience, the exposure of the child, as well as to the present one. Here are all the elements of an emphatic pronoun of identity. It occurs so early in the literary period that those who regard priority of a usage in literary tradition as evidence of priority of origin, find themselves bereft of an argument to support the view that *ipse intensivum* became *ipse identicum*. Even a stronger demonstrative force than this is found in Cic. De Oratore 3, 129

> Quid de Prodico Cio, de Thrasymacho Calchedonio, de Protagora Abderita loquar? quorum unus quisque plurimum ut temporibus illis etiam de natura rerum et disseruit et scripsit. Ipse ille Leontinus Gorgias . . . . se copiosissimum dicturum esse profitetur.

So without *ille* in Cic. Brutus 112 *Habebat hoc a natura ipsa quod a doctrina non facile posset.*

In order that a regular pronoun of identity develop out of such a deictic pronoun it is only necessary that it should frequently be associated with an antecedent which, like Philtera in the passage from Terence, are conceived of in connection with two or more experiences. In proportion as this last element, namely the consciousness of the connection of the antecedent of *ipse* with different experiences becomes more prominent and the dominance of the demonstrative element grows less, just in that degree does *ipse* approach the idea of identity. But scarcely any change in language is so common as the loss of demonstrative force in a pronoun. There is no Indo-European language from which examples might not be cited. In fact the change may fairly be assumed to be as general as is the tendency of all acts of will, when frequently repeated, to become impulsive and automatic. It only remains then to explain how *ipse* came to be associated with an antecedent, which was itself associated with two experiences. This is in part made clear by the etymology of *ipse*. It certainly goes back to the determinative pronoun *is*. While *is* was primarily a pronoun of the dér-demonstration it had already in the pre-literary period developed two usages which led directly toward the pronoun of identity. These are the anaphoric and the correlative functions. An examination of the cases in which *ipse* expresses identity shows that the earlier examples are almost entirely confined to these two groups. For example, in the first book of Ennius' Annals (certainly written before 184 B. C., and so considerably antedating Terence's Hautontimorumenos) occurred the words (line 8 M)

Terraque corpus,
Quae dedit, ipsa capit nec dispendi facit hilum,

in which *ipse* is clearly a pronoun of identity. Numerous

other cases might be cited, but it will be sufficient to quote Terence, Phor. 196 *Ipsest quem uolui obuiam.*

The association of *ipse* with the anaphoric and correlative functions, inherited by it as a modified form of the pronoun *is,* was maintained and still further strengthened by the frequent use of other pronouns with anaphoric and correlative force, notably *is hŏc, ille* and *iste,* as modifiers of the same antecedent as *ipse.* As typical examples may be cited

Caes. Bell. Alex. 52, 2 ex contione se Cordubam recepit, eoque ipso die . . . . Minucius . . . . libellum ei tradidit;

Caes. Bell. Gall. 6, 37, 1 hoc ipso tempore et casu;

Cic. Tusc. disp. 4, 50 Herculem, quem in caelum ista ipsa, quam vos iracundiam esse vultis, sustulit fortitudo, iratumne censes conflixisse cum . . . . apro . . . .?

That these demonstrative pronouns were merely contributory elements in the concept which the phrase symbolized, while *ipse* was the predominating element, is shown by the forms that resulted from the fusion of the pairs of words. Italian *desso* and *stesso* have retained the vowel of *ipse* but lost those of *id* (and *idem*)[1] and *istu-*. This could not have happened had not *ipse* borne the stress accent of the phrases; and the stressed quality of *ipse* shows it to have been the dominating element.

Idem ipse might have been added to the four phrases just mentioned. Considerable discussion has arisen over the question as to whether this locution really occurs in Cicero. The statement of Schmalz, Lateinische Gram. p. 444 (3d ed.) "*idem ipse* . . . . dem Cicero entschieden

[1] The question as to whether *desso* is descended from *id ipsum* or *idem ipsum* is meaningless, since *idem ipsum* must have developed into both a synonym and a homonym of *id ipsum.* On the history of *id ipsum* see Lat. Pron. p. 168 ff.)

abzusprechen ist" is taken directly from the discussion of his friend Landgraf, which occurs in note 378 (p. 122) of their joint revision of Reisig-Haase's Vorlesungen über latein. Syntax. Landgraf points out that the manuscripts of Cicero show the collocation in six passages:

In Verrem 1, 71 Haec eadem ipsa se ex Philodamo audisse dicat;

Post reditum in senatu 33 Nec mihi ipse ilie animus idem meus, vobis non incognitus defuit; sed videbam . . . . ;

Orator 235 aut scribant aliquid vel Isocrateo more vel quo Aeschines aut Demonsthenes utitur, ... aut reperiam ipsa eadem condicione qui uti velit, ut aut dicat aut scribat utra voles lingua eo genere quo illi volunt;

Tusc. disp. 1, 40 Ego enim ipse cum eodem ipso non invitus erraverim;

Pro lege Manilio 46 Quid? Idem ipse Mithridates nonne ad eundem Cn. Pompeium legatum usque in Hispaniam misit?

Tusc. disp. 5, 26 Negat (sc. Epicurus) quemquam iucunde posse vivere, nisi idem honeste, sapienter iusteque vivat. Nihil gravius, nihil philosophia dignius, nisi idem hoc ipsum 'honeste, sapienter, iuste' ad voluptatem referret.

In all these passages the readings here given have good manuscript authority. In Orator 235 *ipsa* is even better attested than *ipse*. In Pro lege M. *ipse* has the support of two Oxford manuscripts as well as of the editions of Lambinus of 1566 and 1584 the Ascensiana of 1511, while Orelli would retain *ipse* but read *item* for *idem*. In all these passages, however, except the last either some or all of the later editors have either changed the case of *ipse*, so that it no longer modifies the same word as *idem* (so in Verr. 1, 71 Benecke changed *ipsa* to *ipse*, Haase and Klotz to *ipso;* in Post red. 33 Haumann conjectured *ipsi* for *ipse*); or they have changed *ipse* to *iste* or *ille* (so Tusc. disp. 1, 40 Matthiae proposed *illo* and Wesenberg

isto, which last Kühner (5th ed.) prefers to *illo* but does not print,—Hasper also retained *ipso;* in Pro l. M. 46 *ipse* has been changed to *iste*). In Tusc. disp. 5, 26 no change has been resorted to because the ambiguous *ĭdem* may be interpreted as masc. sing. and referred to Epicurus.[1] All these changes are, to be sure, slight, and the errors assumed are such as might easily have been made by copyists, although in one case (Tusc. disp. 1, 40), as Kühner remarked, it is not easy to see how a scribe would have changed *isto* to *ipso* when *ipse* preceeds it but two words. Yet the only reason assigned for the changes is the unusual occurrence of the collocation. All, however, seem to have overlooked one important passage, namely Cic. De div. 2, 95

Quid quod uno et eodem temporis puncto nati dissimilis et naturas et vitas et casus habent, parumne declarat nihil ad agendam vitam nascendi Tempus pertinere? Nisi forte putamus neminem eodem tempore ipso et conceptum et natum, quo Africanum,

'unless we are to suppose that no one was both conceived and born at the very same (i. e. exactly the same) time as Africanus.' The correctness of the reading can not be questioned so far as the manuscript authority is concerned. As for the meaning of the phrase, it is clear that neither *idem* nor *ipse,* if used alone, and neither *eo ipso* nor *illo ipso* adequately expressed either the degree of clearness and completeness with which the idea of identity was here conceived by Cicero or the concomitant emotional tone. He had just used the reinforced expression *uno et eodem* and having occasion to express an almost identical idea again, he employed an equally forcible or even more for-

[1] So Kühner *ad loc.*, who objects to the other interpretation, which is advocated by Goerenz *ad* Acad. 1, 1, 2.

cible expression. To change *ipso* to *ipsum* (modifying *neminem*) on the ground that this concept (*neminem*) is contrasted with Africanus, would sadly distort Cicero's thought. The reading *haec eadem ipsa* in Vers. 1, 71 might be similarly defended as a reinforcement of the phrase *haec eadem* which occurs two lines earlier. It is quite possible that in Pro l. M. 46 and Tusc. disp. 1, 40 Cicero employed *ipse* merely because the antecedents of these words stood out more clearly and vividly in his mind than would be indicated by *idem;* in other words *ipse* is here merely a dér-demonstrative. In like manner *ipsa,* while modifying the same concept as *eadem* in De senectute 72 *cum opus ipsa suum eadem quae conglutinavit natura dissolvit,* yet bears the meaning 'of herself,' 'by her own instrumentality' as opposed to a violent death (cf. *vi adhibitā* used just before). From the point of view of semantics no objection can be raised to the expression *idem ipse.* It finds a close parallel in English *self-same.* In view of these facts the statement of Schmalz cited above should be revised. For the later history of the expression see below pp. 85-87.

The essential facts in the development of *ipse* appear then to be as follows: The pronoun *is* (having dér-demonstration) reinforced by the element *-pse,* whatever that may be, was invariably found in association with concepts that stood out sharply and prominently before others of the same unit of thought. The word occurred in a great variety of types of context and received a particular coloring from each. Among these types two were especially noticeable, namely that in which contrast with related objects was implied and that in which identity was implied. The two usages existed side by side from the beginning. The reason why the former occurred more frequently in the classical period is that the concept of identity is not

usually accompanied by so strong a deictic element as that with which *ipse* was associated. Hence the word *idem,* which may, of course, have become associated with the concept of identity much earlier than *ipse,* was adequate to its expression. There is not the slightest doubt, as it seems to me, that could we hear the Romans of Cicero's day talking with one another, *ipse* (or *isse*) would come to our ears as a pronoun of identity much more frequently than it comes to our eyes in the literature.

The words thus far discussed and their derivatives, such as *identisch, identical, übereinstimmend,* appear to be the only ones in the Indo-European languages that are traceable to a pronoun of dér-demonstration, unless it be Greek αὖτός.

In Greek αὐτός, as is well known, is used as an intensive, as a pronoun of identity and a reflexive. It is therefore broadly parallel to *ipse* and German *selbst.* The parallelism with *ipse* is especially close. Wagnon in his essay Le pronom d'identité[1] et la formule du réfléchi (Genève, 1880) p. 1 says "La fonction principale du pronom αὐτός, dans Homère est de rappeler à l'ésprit une personne ou une chose déjà connue, et d'établir son identité en l'opposant à d'autres personnes ou à d'autres objets." In the course of his argument it appears that he has in mind mainly such contrasts as those of the general to his soldiers, the father to his household, the master to his slaves, the warriors to their horses, their chariots, their ships, the body as opposed to the soul, an object from its ornamentations, etc.

[1] The word *identité* is here used in a peculiar sense. It describes all the functions of αὐτός, e. g. αὐτὸς ἔφη (of the Pythagoreans) as well as τὴν δ' αὐτὴν ὁδὸν αὖτις . . . ἀπέσσυτο and ὁ αὐτός = 'the same.'

In *αὐτός* as in *ipse* we find the element of dér-demonstration. Whether the element *αὐ-* is connected with *αὖ-* in *αὖτις* and so *αὐτός* = 'again that' or whether the *υ* is the Sanskrit particle *u*, is not a vital matter to us, since it is clear that the word *αὐτός* is primarily associated with concepts that are 'hervorgehoben' and hence isolated (cf. *αὐτός* = 'alone'). There is, however, a difficulty involved in the derivation (proposed by Wackernagel, Kuhn's Zeitschr. vol. 33 (1895), pp. 17 ff.) of *αὐτός* from a word meaning 'life, breath' represented by Skr. *asuṣ* 'life' 'breath' and Avestan *aŋhu-*, inasmuch as it presupposes that the reflexive usage was the earlier. But the reflexive pronoun is not essentially an isolating word nor even necessarily an emphatic word having no strong deictic force, nor is that element found in *asuṣ* or *aŋhu-*. We find *αὐτός*, to be sure, as an enclitic (Brugmann, Griech. Gram. p. 155, 3d ed. (1900) = Kurze Vgl. Gram. p. 60 (1902) and hence with a weak (non-predominating force). Accepting this derivation the development of the deictic force is difficult of explanation.

In the case of *αὐτός* as in that of *ipse* both the meanings 'self' and 'same' are found in Homer, as is clearly stated in the last edition (vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 630), published in 1898, of Kühner's Griech. Gram. The prior occurrence of "self" in the literature can not therefore be assumed to prove its prior development. Wagnon attempts to prove that, as he puts it, *αὐτός* by itself never means 'the same' (pp. 24-28), assuming that the later distinction *αὐτός 'mème,' ὁ αὐτός 'le mème'* proves that the element of identity is bound up in the definite article. But as there is no definite article in Homer (at least, Wagnon thinks there was not), so there is no *αὐτός* meaning the 'same.' But Hermann, starting out with the etymology *αὐ-* 'again' and *το-ς* 'that,'

assumes that 'the same' is the primitive meaning. This difference of opinion bears a striking resemblance to the famous dispute as to whether the hen or the egg was created first. Wagnon's error grew out of his habitual habit of thinking of a word as having a meaning of its own apart from the context in which it stands; and not regarding it as a function, so to speak, of the unit of thought of which it forms a part. So in saying that *αὐτήν* in the passage from Homer's Iliad (6, 391)

ὁ δ' ἀπέσσυτο δώματος Ἕκτωρ

Τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν αὖτις ἐυκτιμένας κατ' ἀγυίας

does not in itself mean 'the same' but gets that meaning from *αὖτις* 'again,' and in saying again that it gets its meaning of identity from the relative pronoun, as in Odyssey 8, 107 or from the adverb *ἄψ*, as in Odyssey 10, 263 *τὸν δ' ἄψ ἠνώγεα αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἠγήσασθαι*, he is only asserting that which, *mutatis mutandis*, is true in general of every word in every language, and applies as much to *αὐτός* in the meaning 'self,' 'him' or 'alone' as it does to *αὐτός* in the meaning 'same.' If *αὐτό* occurs less frequently in Homer in the meaning 'same' than it does in the meaning 'self,' that fact is possibly due to causes similar to those which led to the less frequent use of *ipse* in this sense (see above p. 45).

The element of meaning that is common to all the uses of *αὐτός* (except its later significations 'he' 'she' 'it' and its unemphatic reflexive use) is a strong dér-demonstration. With it are often associated the notion of isolation, reaching its greatest intensity in those types of context in which *αὐτός* means 'of his own accord,' 'unattended,' 'alone,' etc., and contrast (as set forth above). The particular coloring taken on by *αὐτὸς* will depend chiefly on the ideas which in each particular instance are associated

with the word it modifies or its antecedent. As in the case of *ipse,* there is no evidence sufficient to prove the priority of one of these uses over the others, except in the case of the simple anaphoric and reflexive usages, which, showing no deictic element, appear to be later.

In Germanics the case seems in some senses even clearer. According to Grimm's lexicon *derselbe* indicating identity ist "im Deutschen zu allen Zeiten üblich gewesen," although in some modern dialects other words are generally used in its stead as *der nemliche* in Bavarian and *der gleiche* quite generally. As in Homer αὐτός, so in modern high German *selber,* with strong inflection and without the article, is used to express identity. *þata silba* occurs in Gothic (in the Epistles) for αὐτὸ τοῦτο or τοῦτο αὐτό and *se sylfe* occurs in Old English. Its absence from the literature before King Alfred does not prove its non-existence since these earlier documents are glosses and other forms of composition in which the idea of identity rarely occurs.

One who would advocate the derivation of 'sameness' from 'selfness' could not in Germanics even hope to make out the prior existence of the latter, a thing which is made possible in Greek and Latin only by a strained interpretation.

In Germanics, however, we are not so materially aided by etymology as we are in the case of the Greek and Latin words. No satisfactory etymology for *selb* has been discovered. Neither the suggestion of Grimm nor that of Noreen is mentioned by Kluge, who confines himself to the suggestion occurring in Windisch, Irische Texte 767 (but not mentioned in Fick's Vergleichendes Wörterbuch, part II = Stokes-Bezzenberger, Urkeltischer Sprachschatz, 4th edition, p. 301), merely remarking "ein dem Deutschen eigentümliches Pronomen, das vielleicht eigentlich 'Herr' 'Besitzer' bedeutet (so sind Skr. *patis* und lit. *pats* 'selbst'

identisch)." The main objection to this explanation has been felt to be the transition in meaning from 'possessor' to 'lord' and then to 'self' (cf. Grimm's Wörterbuch, s. v.). Possibly, however, the chief difficulty here lies in the fact that etymologists have compared *selb* with Gk. πόσις and Skr. *patis* 'lord' 'husband' etc., instead of comparing it with Latin *potis, potius, potissimus* 'preferable' etc., and with the enclitic particle *-pte*. For the connection between 'possession' and 'preference' compare Latin *potis* with *potior, potiri* 'to get possession of,' and Irish *selb* 'possession' with Gk. ἑλέσθαι, which commonly means 'select' 'prefer' (so also αἱρέω). The most constant and usually the most prominent element in the meaning of αὐτός, *ipse, selbst* and, we might add, of *pats* and Skr. simás 'self' consists in a certain concentration of the attention which serves to set the 'antecedent' of the word into relief, so to speak, to mark it off distinctly from surrounding concepts. It is thus selected (*hervorgehoben*) from the group to which it belongs and so is "preferred" to them. (Compare what is said on p. 24 about the qualities of the *dér*-demonstration.) *Ich selbst, er selbst, der selbe, ich selber* would thus mean something like 'I preferred,' 'he preferably,' the particular coloring in each case of its occurrence depending upon the special relation of the 'antecedent' to the context. The closest parallel in meaning to this earlier force of *selb* is found in Skr. *eva,* seen not only in such expressions as *sa eva* mentioned above, but also in *mam eva* and *etavad eva.*

The mutual relation of the various uses of the intensive pronouns may be made clear in the case of Latin *ipse,* to which we return for a moment. The Spanish demonstrative *ese, esa, eso,* Portuguese *esse, essa, esso,* is a direct descendant of *ipse,* which even in the time of Catullus was doubtless often pronounced *isse. Ipse* also occurs in the

Italian form *issa* 'now' and old Spanish *esora* 'now' (= *ipsa ora*). Brugmann, Demonstrativpronomina, pp. 121-127, discusses this change of meaning in *ipse* quite fully and apparently considers it quite remarkable. On p. 121 he says "Gegenüber einer ausserordentlich grossen Anzahl von Fällen, wo die demonstrative Bedeutung evident die Ursprünglichere ist, kenne ich nur einen Fall, wo, wie es aussieht, das Verhältniss das umgekehrte ist. Der Begriff 'selbst' liegt nämlich einigen pronominalen Wörtern verschiedener Sprachen zu Grunde, die als Demonstrativa auftreten: griech. *αὐτοῦ αὐτόθι* 'hier, da' *αὐτόθεν* 'von hier, von da' und neugr. *'αὐτός* 'der, dieser,' z. B. *αὐτός ὁ Κύριος εἶνε γνωστός μου* 'dieser Herr ist ein Bekannter von mir,' . . . . span. *ese,* port. esse 'iste, dieser da' aus lat. *ipse,* und nhd. oberd. *selb* (*sel, seb*) 'dér,' z. B. *sel ĭšt wār* 'das ist wahr,' wozu *selb* auch als Adverbium, 'dort' und damals." Brugmann then goes on to state that in the cases of *αὐτός, ipse* and *selbst* this change of meaning is the result of the association of the three words with other words having in themselves demonstrative meaning, e. g. *αὐτός* 'self' became *αὐτός* 'this' through continual use in such combinations as *αὐτοῦ ἔνθα, που αὐτοῦ, αὐτοῦ τῷδ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ, αὐτοῦ ταύτῃ, der selbe, ipsa hac hora, ipso eo die.* By the process of absorption (Verdichtung, saturation, Bréal: irradiation) the words then took on (according to B.) the demonstrative force. It is clear from what Brugmann says on p. 127 (top) that he conceived *ipse* and possibly[1] *αὐτός* to have originally had a demonstrative force, to have subsequently lost it, and then to have developed it again in the manner indicated. As for *selbst* he doubtless made no assumption as to its original meaning.

[1] In Gr. Gram. 3d ed. (1900), § 282 he appears to accept the connection of *αὐτός* with Skr. *asuṣ*, in which case it would not originally have had a demonstrative force.

Now what is a demonstrative pronoun? But pronouns, like all other words, represent not homogeneous but complex (often extremely complex) concepts. Elements of feeling as well as ideas enter prominently into them. The element which is especially characteristic of them, however, is that referred to above in the discussion of *ipse* (see p. 77) under (1). The person who uses a demonstrative pronoun does so because he wishes to change the direction of the listener's attention; he wishes to have it centered upon some object. The word has a similar effect to *"look!" "see!"* With this general (colorless) deictic force are always associated other elements. Most frequently some indication of the local or temporal relations of the object referred to is given, e. g. *here, there, yonder.* Sometimes, however, no notion of the location of the object in space or time enters into the meaning of the word, but instead some ethical element corresponding with the speaker's attitude toward it, which may be one of admiration or of *contempt,* depreciation, etc. This last element is frequently found in association with *iste* and Spanish *ese.* That the general deictic force enters into meaning of *ipse* in its ordinary intensive use is clear. This element of meaning is found in it from its first appearance in the literature. It is only later on in the development of the meaning of the word that this element becomes less prominent. When it does become less prominent we find *ipse* in the meaning 'he, she, it,' i. e. as a mere anaphoric pronoun (Lat. Pron. pp. 184-190). It is certainly not from this last meaning that Spanish *ese,* nor *αὐτός* 'this' nor *selb* 'that' developed. Its direct descendant is Ital. *esso* 'he, it.' The various uses of *ipse* are all due to the diverse types of context in which the word occurs, each special type giving a special coloring to the general deictic force

of the word. Just as in the case of **oinos* (see p. 45) we find at least five groups of meanings ('he,' 'this,' 'that,' '1,' 'same') developing independently from the original dér-deictic force so in *ipse*, *αὐτός* and *selbst; αὐτός* for example was used in the meanings 'the master' (*αὐτὸς ἔφη*), 'sua sponte,' 'alone' 'an sich' (as in "*das Ding an sich*"), 'the same,' 'even,' 'he she it,' 'this,' 'that,' the reflexive use, etc, no one of which, with perhaps the exception of the last, need to be considered as growing out of any other. The occurrence of the meanings 'this' or 'that' is no more difficult to account for than that of 'alone' or 'the same.' It is not, however, necessary to assume that the meanings 'this' and 'that' grew up in connection with any particular word or group of words, such as *ἔνθα*, *hac* or *der*. In fact the auxiliary background of discourse, the "general context," with which the particular words *ἔνθα*, etc., are often, but not always, associated, is the important factor in determining the shade of meaning. Just as *ipse* 'self' developed from its frequent association with a concept which is itself set into two or more different relationships (cf. p. 40), so *αὐτός* 'this' developed from its frequent association with objects which the speaker felt as near him in space, time, or interest. Just as *is*, *hic* and *ille* or the relative pronoun were often found in connection with *ipse* developing the meaning 'same,'[1] so *ταύτη*, *τοῦτο*, *τῷδε*, etc., were often found in connection with *αὐτός* developing the meaning. They were factors which aided the development of the meaning, but probably not the most

[1] It is true that *ist*[o] + *esso* (for *ipso*) did come to be extensively used as a pronoun of identity, covering, in fact, near the whole Italian peninsula (Ital. *stesso*, *lo stesso*). This prevalence of *isto* in the compound instead of *hic* or *is* is due to the fact that *hic* and *is* came to be very weak demonstratives, and eventually passed out of use.

important factors. The same is true *mutatis mutandis* of *ipse* and *selbe*.

The use of *ipse* as a pronoun of identity is established for the whole western Mediterranean basin between the third and the sixth centuries A. D. Its occurrence in Isidore (e. g. Mystic. Exposit. Sacramentorum 1, 2) establishes it for Spain and in Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica for England. During these centuries, however, it is much more common in the simple anaphoric force 'he, she, it' and as the evidence of the Romance languages shows (French même, Span. mesm) the doubly intensified form *metipsimum* ultimately supplanted it over a large territory.

This use of *ipse* is of interest in connection with the similar usage of *se sylfe* in Old English. Bede (8th century) still uses *idem* as the ordinary pronoun of identity, while *ipse* in his writings very commonly has the meaning 'he, she, it,' or is used as a definite article. Yet *ipse* occurs occasionally as a pronoun of identity. In King Alfred's translation *sylfa* occurs seventeen times[1] in connection with the definite article *se*, the two words taken together meaning 'the same.' In two of these cases it translates the Latin relative pronoun: Bk. IV l. 3285 (Schipper) *Ða wæes on þære sylfan nihte, þse ælmihtiza Drihten . . . . qua videlicet nocte Dominus omnipotens . . . .* cf. Bk. V. l. 840 *Done sylfan rim wintra = quem numerum annorum;* twice it represents *idem*, once *eadem ipsa*, once *id ipsum*, in which passage, however, *id ipsum* means merely 'it.' In the other eleven cases (in all therefore except four) it is associated with *ipse: ipse qui* (five passages), *quod ipsum* (two passages) *hoc ipsum* (two passages) and *ipse* alone (twice). The occurrence of *se sylfe* under these conditions, taken in connection with its rarity in other Old English

[1] There may be a very few more cases.

writings and the great frequency with which *se ilca* is used may be taken as indicating that *se sylfe* had already (previous to Alfred's translation of Bede) developed the meaning 'the same,' although the word was used in this sense only occasionally, and that on the basis of this already established usage the translator used it in at least thirteen cases, where had he not been influenced by *ipse* he might have written *se ylca.* We can hardly suppose that this and other translations from the Latin could have exerted any great influence in the way of encouraging the general usage of *se sylfe* as an expression of identity outside of the literary compositions. Even in the literature it has remained infrequent up to the present day. We shall probably not be far from right, if we think of the influence of *ipse* on the use of *se sylfa* in about the same light as we think of the influence of ὁ αὐτός 'the same' on *ipse* 'the same' (see Latin Pron. p. 170).

The number of cases in which the same word not only expresses the concept of identity and the reflexive idea but also appears as an intensive, suggests the inquiry as to the genetic relation of the three functions. In the case of *ipse* it is clear that the reflexive use was of later origin. In the classical period *ipse* is not used as a reflexive except when a very emphatic reflexive is in question. *Ipse* itself is rarely found alone as the symbol of reflexivity. As is well known, it is mostly used merely to intensify a reflexive proper in such forms as *me ipsum, se ipsum,* and the tendency of the word to appear in the nominative case instead of an oblique case, as in the two forms just mentioned, shows that its association with the idea of reflexivity was more or less loose.

The same may be said of αὐτός. It occurs sporadically as a reflexive in Homer and perhaps in Attic tragedy, yet in the Homeric passages its antecedent stands in sharp

contrast with some other concept and so shows clearly its intensive quality (cf. Odys. 21, 249 ἦ μοι ἄχος περί τ' αυτοῦ καὶ περὶ πάντων), and in tragedy it is found in connection with a nominative αὐτός, αὐτοί, etc., as in the phrase αὐτὸς καθ' αὐτοῦ (the manuscripts also read αὐτοῦ). These facts appear to me to speak against the derivation of αὐτὸς from the same source as Sanskrit *asuṣ*, Avestan *aŋhu-* mentioned above.[1] For while it is conceivable that a word like *asuṣ* or *ātman*, both meaning originally 'breath,' 'life,' 'soul,' etc., and subsequently assuming the reflexive meaning in Avestan and Sanskrit respectively, may have absorbed a certain element of emotion ("Gefühlston") from its frequent appearance in certain types of context, yet it remains true that this "Gefühlston" is the dominating element in αὐτός, and that the reflexive idea is only imperfectly developed throughout the whole literary period down at least to the time of Aristotle. The development of a reflexive out of such ideas as breath, soul, etc., is paralleled by the development of personal pronouns from such concrete concepts as 'my head,' 'your head,' 'my body,' etc. (see Wundt, Völkerps. vol. 1, pt. 2, chap. 6, II, 6, a). It is further significant that the Sanskrit *ātman* is never used as a pronoun of identity.

Old Prussian *sups* appears to be a case in which the reflexive pronoun itself is the source of the *pronomen intensivum*, being derived from **sue* and the *bh-* suffix. The Russian words *sobŏ* 'peculiarity,' *sóbstvenno* 'peculiarly' suggest, however, that the *bh-* suffix so modified the mean-

[1] Of course, a word in a pure reflexive sense may be emphatic. Cf., for example, Mahābhārata, Nala Episode 6, 11 & 12

Evaṁrūpam Nalam yo vāi kāmayec chapituṁ, Kalē,
Atmānam sa çapen mūdho, hanyād atmānam ātmanā

'He who would curse Nala, will curse himself and slay himself by himself (i. e. through his own action).

ing of the word (cf. Skr. *sabhā* 'meeting' in which all trace of the reflexive has disappeared), that the reflexive meaning no longer played a part in it, when the word took on the meaning 'self.' As far as the usage is concerned it corresponds to Ger. *selbe* in the three uses: (a) *stansubban* (acc. sg. masc.) = *den selben* (§ 2 and 11) and *denselbigen* (§§ 13; 19), in all cases an anaphoric pronoun and not a pronoun of identity, (b) *sien sups* = *ihm selbst* (§ 20), *esse Christo subban* = *vonn* (*sic!*) *Christo selbs* (§ 40), *tien subban* = *dich selbst* (§ 65) (c) *Noe subban Asman* = *Noe, selb Acht* (§ 85) 'Noah and seven others'; but nowhere in the extant Prussian text does it have the reflexive meaning except in the group *tien subban* (l. c.) into the meaning of which the personal pronoun enters. The extant remains of Old Prussian are very scanty, to be sure,—perhaps too scanty to justify certain inferences concerning the question in hand. It is significant, however, that *sups* does not when standing by itself have a reflexive meaning. In this respect it is perfectly in accord with *se* (*me, te,* etc.) *ipsum,* ἑαυτόν (ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, etc.), and *sich* (*dich, mich,* etc.) *selbst.* This fact suggests that the intensive force was earlier (in a causal sense) than the reflexive.

As no word outside of the Latin language has been shown to be cognate with *par,* it would scarcely be profitable to enter into speculations on the genesis of its meaning. As to its actual usage, however, a few words may not be amiss. *Par* is widely used in Latin to express that form of identity which is the result of abstracting from the empirical definiteness only (form 2). It is accordingly used when two objects are compared, which though distinct entities, have otherwise identical qualities. This appears to be what Quintilian means when he writes (7, 4, 6) *forsitan ne sint quidem paria, quae ulla parte sunt dissimilia.* In the

case, therefore, of abstract general concepts, such as time and space and others used as standards for comparison, *par* would express complete identity, except in so far as more or less definite concrete images induced by the physical qualities of the objects compared or by their material environment, may be associated with the abstract concept. To illustrate, in the following passages from Caesar, Bell. Gall. 7, 23, 1 *trabes derectae perpetuae in longitudinem paribus intervallis distantes inter se* and 7, 23, 2 *paribus intermissis spatiis singulae* (sc. *trabes*) *singulis saxis interiectis arte contineantur, intervallis* and *spatiis* may represent concrete images of the interspaces, and this interpretation is rendered probable by the use of the plural. With these two examples let us compare two further passages:

Bell. Gall. 1, 43, 2 Legionem Caesar, quam equis, devexerat, passibus cc ab eo tumulo constituit; item equites Ariovisti pari intervallo constiterunt;

Bell. Alex. 73, 1 Caesar cum ab hoste milia passuum v castra posuisset videretque eas valles, quibus regia castra munirentur, eodem intervallo sua castra munituras, si modo ea loca hostes priores non cepissent, ...

The passages are so closely parallel that it seems forced to interpret them differently. The same is true of the following two:

Cicero, In Verr. 5, 6 At cum esset in Italia bellum tam prope a Sicilia, tamen in Sicilia non fuit. Quid mirum? Ne cum in Sicilia fuit eodem intervallo, pars eius belli in Italiam ulla pervasit;

Curtius 3, 1, 12 Gordium nomen est urbi quam . . . pari intervallo Pontico et Cilicio mari distantem.

Other examples of *par* in this sense are:

Caes. Bell. Gall. 5, 13, 2 Hibernia insula, dimidio minor, ut

existimatur, quam Britannia, sed pari spatio transmissus, atque ex Gallia est in Britanniam.

Note especially Quintilian 1, 10, 39 'quorum locorum extremae lineae eandam mensuram colligunt, eorum spatium quoque, quod his lineis continetur, par sit necesse est' 'figures having the same circumference have the same area.'

Finally note Cicero, Pro Sulla 5 indicium meum et horum par atque unum fuisse.

Another point of contact between *par* and *idem* is found in their use as modifiers of words symbolizing objects that are of simple (homogeneous) structure, i. e. consisting (as far as they exist in consciousness) of only one quality. So in Phaedrus 3, 13, 6 *Non inconveniens corpus et par est color,* 'the color of the working bees and the drones is the same.' This passage seems to exemplify a case of complete fusion, as does perhaps the following also:

. . . . facie simulacrum pari,
Una statura, simile et membris omnibus
. . . . finxit (sc. Dolus),

i. e. Dolus made a statue of the same appearance with the statue of Truth made by Prometheus.

Par is used to express form (4) in Val. Max. 4, 1, 13

Eundem (=itemque eum) constat pari vultu et exulem fuisse et restitutum. Adeo moderationis beneficio medius semper inter secundas et adversas res animi firmitate uersatus est, 'He showed the same calm expression of countenance both during his exile and after his recall;'

Script. Hist. Aug. Alex. Sev. 29, 5 . . . . neque umquam taediavit aut morosus aut iratus residit, fronte semper pari et laetus ad omnia;

[Fredegar,] Chron. 1, 62 (=p. 85, 14 Kr.) Iustinianus . . . . et Bellessarius comex aestabolarius . . . . iurantes sibi, quantum cuiusquam ex his causa proficeret, pare (*for* parem) sempiternam fidem servarit.

A still clearer case is Cic. Pro Sulla 5 *intelliges et de hoc et de aliis indicium meum et horum par atque unum fuisse,* with which compare the following passage from Plautus, Bacch. 1108-1111

> **Igitur pari fortuna, aetate ut sumus, utimur.—Sic est. sed tu**
> **Quid tibist?—Pol mihi par idemst quod tibi.—**
> **Numquidnam ad filium haec aegritudo adtinet?—**
> **Admodum.—Idem mihi morbus in pectorest.**

For the redoubling cf. *idem unum* Poen. 1340.

It is hardly necessary to quote more passages in illustration of the range of meaning of *par* unless it be to call attention to a few very common phrases in which *par* and *idem* appear in parallel usages. These phrases are *pari modo, pari ratione, pari sorte,* etc. Nepos, Them. 5, 3 *nam pari modo apud Salamina parvo numero navium maxima . . . . classis est devicta;* cf. Timol. 1, 5 *hoc praeclarissimum eius factum non pari modo probatum est ab omnibus;* Cato 3, 4 *reliqua quoque bella pari modo persecutus est;* Dat. 10, 2; Ammian. Marcel. 17, 12, 16 *pari modo ipsi quoque adepti, pacem;* 22, 9, 5; 24, 5, 9 *pari modo ut antea;* 26, 5, 2, etc.; cf. C. I. L. VI. 2976; Jordanes Get. 63 *navibus . . . . in instar pontium tabulatis atque consertis Thraciam petit et Moesiam, pontemque rursus in Danubio pari modo constructum . . . . repedavit;* 186 *pari etiam modo.* Jordanes commonly uses *pari tenore* in the same sense; cf. Rom. 129; Get. 155; 122; 245 f.; 313 and Orosius, Adv. pag. 1, 19, 2 has *parili via. Pari sorte* is found in Ammian. Marcel 14, 4, 3; 22, 3, 7; 23, 5, 6. The author of the Bellum Hispaniense writes 52, 2 *hoc* (= *huc,* i. e. 'to Caesar's position') *cum Pompeius cum suis copiis venisset, ex adverso pari ratione castra ponit.* In the passage *ratio,* as not infrequently in classical Latin, is synonymous with *modus,* so that here and in Apuleius,

De hab. doctr. Platonis phil. p. 640, 6 (Delphin edition) (cf. p. 596, 10 *nec pari ant simili modo*) *pari ratione* is an equivalent of *eodem modo.* Furthermore the author of the Bell. Hisp. only a few lines below the passage just quoted uses *pari condicione,* a phrase which recurs in 31, 2 *congressus enim et clamor, quibus rebus maxime hostis conterretur, in conlatu pari erant condicione.* The author of chapter 101 of the De Bello civili also writes in § 4 *nostri . . . . propter eundem timorem pari atque antea ratione egerunt,* perhaps intentionally selecting *pari* to avoid the repetition of *idem.* Such a motive may also explain the occurrence of *par* in Cic. Acad. 2, 125 *innumerabiles paribus in locis esse eisdem nominibus, honoribus, rebus gestis, ingeniis, formis, aetatibus, eisdem de rebus disputantes?* and Bell. Hisp. 25, 1 *pari consuetudine cum ad eundem locum . . . . venisset* (cf. 12, 4 *pari consuetudine = eodem modo*).

Other close parallels in meaning between *par* and *idem* are Ennius, Fab. 121 (M)

qui alteri exitium parat,
Eum scire oportet, sibi paratum, pestem ut participat parem;

Pacuvius 174 (R) Par fortitudo, gemina confidentia;

Auctor ad Heren. 2, 29, 46p Simile vitiosum est, quod de aliqua parte dissimile est nec habet parem rationem comparationis;

Catullus 28, 11 quantum video, pari fuistis casu i. e. 'in the same "box" as I'; cf. 38 f.; 57, 3;

Sallust, frag. hist. 2, 98, 7 (M) itaque meo et hostium exercitui par condicio est; namque stipendium neutri datur;

Tac. Hist. 1, 32 neque illis (sc. plebi et servis) indicium aut veritas, quippe eodem die diversa pari certamine postulaturis; Ann. 16, 10 cognitum reo, seque et libertum pari sorte componi;

Apuleius, Met. 11, 24 (= p. 271, 22 V) dies etiam tertius pari

caerimoniarum ritu celebratus; 10, 27 (=p. 244, 11 V) pari casu mortis; 5, 27 (=p. 115, 7 V) *pari modo* 'likewise';

Script. Hist. Aug. Gall. 5, 5 ut uno die quinque milia hominum pari morbo ('pestilence') perirent.

All in all par (<*pars), păris appears, on the basis of its meaning, to admit of being compared with Greek παραί (dative) and παρά into the various meanings of which the idea of nearness or juxtaposition enters, appearing in various forms in association with the different cases. Note especially παρὰ τὸ Σοφόκλειον ('like') Schol. ad Apollonius Rhod. 158. The idea of *comparison* is found in the compounds παραβάλλω (-βολή), παρατίθημι, παρατάσσω, παρεταξω, παρασυμβάλλαμαι, παρασυναγωγή, παρεμφέρω (cf. παρεμφής 'resembling'); παραμετρέω (παραμέτρησις), παραθεῖομαι; παρεικάζω. In πάρεγγυς the gemination of the element of nearness yields 'resembling, like' (ἐγγύς alone appears not to have this meaning), while παρόμοιος expresses the idea of likeness in intensified form (cf. *consimilis*).[1] Other cases in which words expressing local or spacial contiguity or nearness have come to be associated with some form of identity are Russian *pokhoziŭ, skhožiŭ,* from *khoditĕ* 'walk' 'go' related to Latin *cēdo* (= *cĕ-zdo < cĕ-sedo;* base **sede-*, cf. ὁδός) and the prepositions *po* 'to' 'by' and *so* 'with.' Compare also *ga-* 'with' in Goth. *ga-leiko.* The writer knows a small child who habitually says, "Doll and Poll sound together," meaning 'have the same sounds.'

[1] In παρέοικα, πάρισος παρὰ has an attenuating force (corresponding to Russian *po*) which is closely associated with the idea of nearness.

II. *IDEM* AS AN ANAPHORIC PRONOUN: "ADVERBIAL" *IDEM*

The classical usage of the pronoun *idem* is so well understood and in general so uninvolved, that the writers of grammars and students of Latin syntax usually have given little attention to it. Kühner, for example, in his Ausführliche Grammatik vol. II. pp. 457 ff. devotes but one page to *idem,* and in this page its usage is very summarily disposed of. The later development of this pronoun has been even less fully treated. In Schmalz's Lateinische Syntax, which purports to be an historical syntax, the pronouns find no treatment. In his Stilistik is found only the following statement concerning *idem:* "und nun" (i. e. 'nachdem *is* ausser Kurs kam') "mussten *hic, iste, ille, ipse, idem* für dasselbe eintreten. Dadurch verloren auch diese ihre Bedeutung, und so erklärt sich, dass die Verbindung *idem ipse,* die dem Cicero entschieden abzusprechen ist, schon bei Gellius vorkommt und dann im afrikanischen Latein allgemein üblich wird." It is scarcely necessary to point out the inaccuracy of this passage, yet attention should be called to the following facts, which reveal some of the expressed and implied errors of Schmalz's statement: (1) *is* is not much less extensively used in the literature of the second and third or even fourth centuries A. D. than it is in Cicero's and Caesar's writings; (2) *hic, iste, ille, ipse, idem* are all used as determinatives long before *is* can be said to have come "ausser Kurs"; (3) these pronouns can scarcely be said with fairness to have lost their meaning in consequence of their usage in the place of *is,* since they would not have come to be associated with the ideas with which *is* was ordinarily associated

until *after* they had already "lost their meaning"; (4) the statement concerning the occurrence of *idem ipse* in Cicero is fully discussed on pp. 41-44 above. Schmalz is not to blame; there were no treatises on *idem* from which he could draw material, and he was obliged to depend upon scattered and inaccurate statements about its usage. A somewhat more definite statement is made by Haase in Note 368 to Reisig's Vorlesungen über latein. Sprachwissenschaft: "Für *idem* zeigen die Späteren eine gewisse Vorliebe, z. B. schon Valerius Maximus." He then cites two passages from Valerius and adds: "wo Cicero *is* gesetzt haben würde; und allmählich schwächte sich die Bedeutung von *idem* ganz ab, so dass es geradezu für *is* steht." The first statement of Haase is wrong, in spite of the latitude which *gewisse* gives to *vorliebe*. To show this it is only necessary to construct a comparative table showing the relative frequency of *idem* in various authors as compared with the frequency of the occurrence of the other pronouns. Such a table shows the following percentages. The occurrences of *hic, iste, ille, is, idem, ipse* combined equal 100 per cent. The historians and Christian writers are grouped separately.

Caesar	6	Macrobius	9
Velleius Paterc.	8½	Apuleius	5
Curtius	7½	Dictys	5
Tacitus	10	Dares	5
Florus	5	Fronto, Epist.	2½
Suetonius	5	M. Aurel., Epist.	5
Scrip. Hist. Aug.	3 to 8½	Pliny, Epist.	6½
Justin	8	Seneca Rhetor	4
Victor	8	Minuc. Felix	7
Cato, De agr.	11¼	Tertullian	7½
Vitruvius	9	Cyprian	3 to 4
Pliny, N. Hist.	12	Lactantius	4
Gaius	8	Firmicus Mat.	4
Gromatici	3 to 11	Lucifer	2

Censorinus, De die nat.	8¾	Priscillian	2
Boethius, Arith.....	15	Augustine	3
Boethius, De cons...	3½	Sanct. Silv. Per.....	9
Valerius Max	9⅓	Alcimus Avitus.....	2
Frontinus, Strateg...	14	Pastor Hermae.....	3
Gellius	7		

From this table it appears that Cato, the earliest prose writer of whose works we have any considerable remains, employs *idem* with greater relative frequency than any other writer, early or late, except Pliny the Elder and Frontinus. Over the proportion in Caesar there is rarely an increase of more than 3 per cent while many of the later writers show 3 or 4 per cent less than Caesar. It is probable that Haase's statement is an unwarranted generalization based upon some parts of Pliny or Frontinus, in which many cases of *idem* may occur within a few pages. How easy it is to be so misled is shown by the example of Landgraf, who only a few lines below the statement just cited from Haase writes, "Auffällig ist die Verwilderung im Gebiete der Pronomina in der spätlateinischen Schwindelliteratur, z. B. im libellus de Constantino eiusque matre Helena, wo im cap. 1 fünf" (he should have written *sechs*) "mal *idem* gebraucht ist." Yet he fails to add the equally striking, or rather much more striking, circumstance that in the remaining 47 chapters of the story the word occurs scarcely more than five times. Landgraf also omits to add in this note the statement that Lupus, Der Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos, p. 110 quotes the usage *idem* = *is* from the life of Epaminondas 10, 2 with the words "*idem* steht breit für *is*."

On the whole one should avoid attaching undue weight to such statistics as are given in the above table. The relative frequency with which a word is used is of slight significance, when the variation is no greater than is indi-

cated in the table. It is of much greater importance to know (1) in how far an author's subject matter conditions his use of a word (note for example the difference between Boethius' De consolatione and his Arithmetica), (2) in what specific functions the given word is used in each author, (3) whether other synonymous words are taking the place of the one in question.

The citations and references just given sum up about all that has been written about *idem*. All else is found in scattered references in indices, lexica and annotations. For example, Acidalio on Velleius Paterculus 2, 42 (Padua, 1590) states that *idem* is used by Velleius for *is*. Fritsche, Sprachgebrauch des Velleius p. 20 will not admit the truth of Acidalio's statement. The rubric *idem* = *is* is found in several of the excellent indices in the volumes of the Corpus Script. Eccl. Roman. Vindobon. Lastly the authors of treatises on the Latinity of particular writers, such as Kotziol, Der Stil des Apuleius, mention the usage.

In the following pages only two phases of the history of *idem* are taken up, namely its shift of meaning from a pronoun of identity to an anaphoric (personal) pronoun, that is to a range of meaning, or rather meanings, approximating those of *is* which occur most frequently in classical Latin.

This change of meaning is only a special illustration of the transformation of pronouns having a demonstrative element in their meaning into personal pronouns or definite articles. Examples of the general change are found in all the languages of the Indo-European family. Cases of Latin-Romance shiftings are discussed in Meader. Lat. Pron. pp. 161, 184-190, 192-214. The following is not much more than an outline and makes no pretension to being exhaustive or final.

We are met at the outset by an annoying limitation. Owing to the infrequency of the employment of *idem* (it is much less frequently used than *ipse* and the other demonstratives), we have at our disposal only about one eighth as much material as is available for *is,* and one fourth as much as for *hic.* There are two main reasons for this: First, the very patent fact, that a writer has much less frequent occasion to express the concept of identity than he has to express the local and temporal categories of nearness and remoteness, and the corresponding prevailingly emotional concepts of inclination toward an object, expressed by *hic* and *iste,* and disinclination, aversion, repudiation, etc., expressed by *ille* and *iste.* In the second place, as we have already seen, the Romans possessed a number of other words synonymous with *idem,* some of which, like *par* and *ipse,* were very extensively employed. However, notwithstanding this limitation, there is still material enough to form an adequate basis for conclusions. Neither Raphael Kühner, nor Draeger, Historische Syntax, mention the usage. No English, American or German dictionary mentions it, so far as I have observed, and there is no systematic treatment of it in any book.

By derivation *idem* is plainly the pronoun *is* plus a deictic particle.[1] The meaning was therefore originally something like 'just that,' 'precisely that.' There is no reason for doubting that *is* was originally a deictic pronoun, and, in fact, clear traces of an earlier strong deictic force are found in some of its classical usages. This accounts for the deictic element often entering into the meaning of *idem,* albeit that element in classical Latin is usually quite attenuated, and becomes still less prominent in the course of the centuries. In the classical period it is the

[1] On this particle see p. 28 below.

concept of identity, particularly the specific forms 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 described above, that predominates in the meaning of the word.

However, the degree of clearness and distinctness with which we apperceive this dominating element varies greatly from instance to instance. Since *idem* is the antonym of *alius,* it is clear that the concept of identity will stand out with special prominence in those passages in which the word stands in expressed or implied contrast with words symbolizing difference, as in the bald affirmation *hanc rem non aliud, sed idem est* or some less direct form as *de hac aliis aliter indicare licet, ego eandum eam esse puto quae et ante exposita est;* or

Cic. De imp. Pomp. Mag. 50 cur non . . . . eidem, cui cetera summa cum salute reipublicae commissa sunt, hoc quoque bellum regium committamus?

or Cato frag. 128 si quis strenue fecerat, donabam honeste, ut alii idem vellent facere.

In such types of context as these, which of themselves contribute so largely to the emphasizing of the concept of identity, *idem* will naturally retain its distinctive classical meaning (form 1). So also in German it is noticeable that, although *derselbe* has at present come to be used so extensively as a mere anaphoric pronoun, yet wherever such a contrast is expressed in the context, the concept of identity comes out distinctly. The following examples show this clearly (all are taken from Lipps' Logik): ". . . . die Bewustwerdung verschiedener Seiten desselben psychischen Thatbestandes; Es ist das Bewusstsein, dass derselbe Name auch noch andern Gegenständen zugehöre; Die Identität ist begriffliche, wenn verschiedene Namen trotz ihrer Verschiedenheit die Vorstellung desselben Inhaltes fordern; Wir betrachten ein Haus, dessen einzelne Theile

allmählich durch andere ersetzt wurden, als noch d a s s e l b e Haus." Except as occurring in a context of the character of these and a few others to be mentioned below, *derselbe* is very rarely found in association with the concept of identity. The case of *idem* is parallel, although in the extant literature down as far as Justinian the development does not appear to have advanced so far as in German. No doubt it had gone farther in the spoken dialects, if the word was not already becoming obsolete in them.

It is especially form 1 (absolute identity) that is thus clearly brought out by the contrast with an antonym. In a similar manner forms 4, 5 and 6 stand out with greater distinctness in proportion to the clearness with which multiplicity of the results (attributes or predicates) or (in form 6) the objects is apperceived. So in Terence, Adelphoe 73 *praesens absensque idem erit* the words *praesens absensque* contribute very materially to the intensification of the idea of identity with which *idem* is associated. In German likewise *derselbe* still retains its older force in sentences of this type; e. g. diese beiden Sätze sagen dasselbe; In der That kommt in beiden derselbe psychische Thatbestand oder Erkenntnissinhalt zum Bewusstsein; Dieselben Sätze können Ausdruck sein für Namenurtheile und Urtheile über die mit den Namen benannten Sachen; Wir nennen dasselbe Ding mit Rücksicht auf dasselbe Geschehen aktiv oder passiv, je nachdem wir, u. s. w. (Lipps, Logik). In other types of context than this and that mentioned in the preceding paragraph *derselbe* has practically everywhere[1] come to be used as an anaphoric pronoun.

We may now examine the various types of context in

[1] The meaning also survives in some old stereotyped expressions, such as *oder was dasselbe sagen will.*

which *idem* occurs, with a view to noting how far they illustrate the same shift of meaning. *Idem* is frequently used to refer to a concept which has already occurred either in the same sentence in which *idem* stands or in the preceding one, or which occurs in the same sentence in which *idem* is found but farther on toward the end of the sentence. This type of context is very generally, though quite inaccurately, described in the grammars. For example Ramshorn (1830), Zumpt (English translation, 1855) and Georges-Mühlmann, Thesaurus d. class. Latinität (1868) s. v. describe this function of *idem* as the 'assignment of a second predicate to one and the same subject.' Gildersleeve-Lodge improves the definition slightly by saying "attribute and predicate." Still better are the practically identical descriptions of Madvig (English transl. 1880), Kühner (1879) and Ellendt-Seyffert (1894). Kühner's statement runs: "Das Demonstrativ *idem*, ebender-selbe, der nämliche, der gleiche, wird oft gebraucht, wenn einem und demselben Gegenstand, von dem schon eine Bestimmung ausgesagt ist, eine andere neue Bestimmung ertheilt wird." The inadequacy of Kühner's statement lies first in the form of statement which is put too strictly from the grammatical point of view and secondly in the exclusion of the numerous cases in which the "antecedent" of *idem* occurs at a later point in the sentence than *idem* itself, i. e. cases in which *idem* "looks forward." From the point of view of the mental processes involved it is a matter of but secondary importance, whether in the course of the organization of a sentence the elements of thought and feeling directly associated with *idem* or the concept to which *idem* refers (i. e. the "antecedent") occurs first, because *both* are more or less clearly present in consciousness during the whole process of the formula-

tion of the sentence. It seems best to free the definition entirely from the trammels of grammatical terminology and state the essential characteristic of the type simply as the appearance of one and the same concept (meaning thereby, of course, what *appears* to the speaker as one and the same concept) in two or more different relationships, the concept being usually (but not always) represented in the second and the succeeding instances by *idem*. It is then a matter of quite minor importance in what specific "construction" the word *idem* stands as viewed from the purely grammatical standpoint. Several examples of this type of sentence are cited above, p. 67. In the great majority of cases *idem* does appear in this type of context as a subject nominative. This fact is what misled Ramshorn, Zumpt and others into framing too narrow a definition. As a matter of fact frequent occurrence of the nominative is of some little importance, as will appear later on.

Two subvarieties of this general usage are recognized by the grammars. The distinction drawn is based not on the meaning of *idem* itself but on the nature of the relationship existing between the two situations involved. The first is well illustrated by

Cic. De nat. deor. 1, 121 Cum enim optimam et praestantissimam naturam dei dicat (*sc.* Epicurus) esse, negat idem esse in deo gratiam;

De harusp. responso 54 Dissensit cum Mario, clarissimo cive, consul nobilissimus et fortissimus, L. Sulla; horum uterque ita cecidit victus, ut victor idem regnaverit.

The strong contrast between the thought of the two clauses in each of these sentences, amounting almost to a contradiction (the two clauses are practically adversative clauses), can not have failed to bring out the concept of

identity[1] with considerable intensity. The contrast is not always so sharp as it is in these two sentences. In fact it would not be difficult to collect a large number of sentences which could be so arranged as to form a series in which the sharpness of the contrast should appear gradually less and less (the diminution in intensity being attended by a corresponding difference in emotional tone, clearly discernible in many cases), until it dwindles down into merely converseness or even diverseness, illustrated by the sentence

De provinc. consul. 24 Num est igitur dubium ex iis rebus, quas is egit agitque cotidie, quin ego in illo oppugnando rei publicae plus quam otio meo, non nulli in eodem defendendo suo plus otio quam communi prospexerint.

If a conjunction had been used here it would doubtless

[1] I can not approve the traditional statement of the grammars, that *idem* in such sentences means 'however he,' 'and yet he,' 'nevertheless he,' etc. The notion of contrast, etc., is just as intimately, in fact even more intimately, associated, for example, with *dicat* and *negat* in the one sentence and with *victus* and *victor* in the other, than it is with *idem*, notwithstanding the fact that *idem* is the (formal) relative (i. e. connecting) word in the sentences. In general it is with the contrasted ideas in such sentences that the "adversative" idea is most closely associated, and not with *idem*. The absence of *tamen* or a synonymous word, which would in reality be somewhat redundant and which we miss merely because of our feeling for the English idiom, is to be explained here in the same manner in which we should explain it in the sentences: *milites erecto animo summa pericula subierunt, dux noluit sese obicere periculis; cum hostes loco et numero, nostri virtute confiderent.* This type of sentence is not of such common occurrence as those of the opposite type (immediately to be described), in which the second half of the sentence has a *cumulative* effect instead of being contrasted with the first, and in which *idem* became closely associated with the cumulative relation.

have been the mild *autem*. With the diminution in the intensity of the contrast must go, *ceteris paribus*, a corresponding diminution in the degree to which the notion of identity predominates in *idem*. This predominance of the element of identity will reach its minimum in those cases in which the second sentence stands in a looser logical relation to the preceding, e. g. Cic. Tusc. disp. 4, 7 *Ut enim in inferiorem ambulationem descendimus, quod fecerамus idem superioribus diebus, acta res est sic.* The parenthetical character of the clause *quod . . . . diebus* betrays the looseness of its relation to the rest of the sentence. Lastly we may cite a somewhat lengthy passage from the Life of Pescennius Niger (Scriptores Hist. Aug. XI. 10 f.):

Hic tantae fuit severitatis, ut, cum milites quosdam in cauco argenteo expeditionis tempore bibere vidisset, iusserit omne argentum summoveri de usu expeditionali, addito eo ut ligneis vasis uterentur. (Four lines omitted.) Idem iussit vinum in expeditione neminem bibere, sed aceto universos esse contentos. Idem pistores sequi expeditionem prohibuit, bucellato iubens milites et omnes contentos esse. Idem ab unius gallinacei direptionem decem commanipulones, qui raptum ab uno comederant, securi percuti iussit, et fecisset, nisi. . .(Seven lines, finishing the story of the chicken-thief, omitted.) Idem iussit, ne zona milites ad bellum ituri aureos vel argenteos nummos portarent, sed publice commendarent, recepturi post proelia quod dederint, addens . . . . Sed haec omnia, ut se habuerat Commodi temporum dissolutio, adversa eidem fuerunt. (Three lines omitted.) Idem in omni expeditione ante omnes militarem cibum sumpsit ante papilionem nec sibi umquam vel contra solem vel contra imbres quaesivit tecti suffragium, si miles non habuit. (Five lines omitted.) Idem in coniuratione iuravit se . . . . in expeditionibus . . . . non aliter . . . . acturum esse quam militem.

In this passage the sentences introduced by *idem* merely continue the narrative. In their effect, however, they are cumulative, each one stating an additional circumstance

that throws light on the character of Pescennius, and thereby they contribute in some slight degree to the clearer apperception of the element of identity. Notwithstanding this, the function of *idem* in these sentences approaches very near to that of a simple anaphonic pronoun.

Closely akin to the last described use of *idem* is its use in headings and titles, as in Ennodius 190a (ed. Vogel), Varro De ling. Lat. 7, 98, Gellius, Macrobius, Augustine's Speculum, and others. See especially the chapter-headings of Bede's Hist. Eccl., e. g. 1, 18; 19; 20; 26; 27; 29; 2, 3, etc., etc. In these last cases, however, the notion of identity is more prominent than in the passage cited from the Scriptores Hist. Aug. In this passage the force '*item*,' which *idem* has absorbed from the context, has given it a new content and brought about a partial shift of the word to the category of a conjunction. As passages of this general character are about the only ones in which *idem* under conditions which in one way or another facilitate, or at least provide an opportunity for, the weakening of the element of identity contained in the word, and as in such passages the word tends toward a conjunction rather than toward an anaphonic pronoun, the nominative case of *idem* is seldom found earlier than the third century A. D. in the function of the pronoun *is*. It is accordingly probable that in Justin, Praef. 4 *Et quae historici Graecorum . . . . occupaverunt, ... ea omnia Pompeius . . . . composuit. Horum igitur quattuor et quadraginta voluminum (nam tot idem edidit) per otium . . . . excerpsi,* the words in the parenthesis should be printed nam totidem edidit, *totidem* being about equivalent to *tot*, just as *ibidem* occasionally = *ibi*.

It is consequently in the oblique cases and in other types of context than those just described that we must expect

to find the transformation of *idem* most complete. The change can take place only under such conditions as both induce a weakening of the element of identity and also have no tendency to induce other elements to the degree that they will predominate over the anaphoric. In the above passages we have only a part of the conditions fulfilled.

The following examples illustrate the range of the usage: Livy 6, 1, 1 *Quae ab condita urbe Roma ad captam eandem urbem Romani . . . . gessere, ... quinque libris exposui* 'from the founding of the city of Rome to *its* capture.' The sharp contrast between *condita* and *captam* characteristic of sentences like Cic. De nat. deor. 1, 121 cited above appears to have had its due influence in bringing about the usage illustrated in Livy (cf. the remark concerning Virgil, Aen. 4, 74-79 cited below, p. 76).

Sallust, Jug. 26, 2 Italici . . . . Adherbali suadent uti seque et oppidum Jugurthae tradat, tantum ab eo vitam paciscatur, de ceteris senatui curae fore. At ille (sc. Adherbal), tametsi omnia potiora fide Jugurthae rebatur, tamen, quia penes eosdem, si advorsaretur, cogundi potestas erat, ita uti censuerant Italici, deditionem facit.

The contrast may have had some influence here. But there is no predominance of the element of identity either in this sentence or in that of Livy.

Boethius, De consol. Phil. 1, 1 pr. 21. After describing in detail the costume in which Philosophia appeared to him, Boethius adds: *Eandem tamen vestem violentorum quorundam sciderant manus.* Here too the analogy of the "contrast" sentences has led Boethius to write *eandem* instead of *eam* or possibly *hanc.*

Plautus, Merc. 672 ff.

SYRA (*anus ancilla*). Nequeo mecastor (*sc.* ocius ire): tantum hoc onerist quod fero.

Dorippa (*mulier*). Quid oneris? Sy. Annos octoginta et quattuor:
Et eodem accedit servitus, sudor, sitis.
Simul haec quae porto deprimunt.

Nepos, Epam. 10, 4 *nemo ibit infitias, Thebas et ante Epaminondam natum et post eiusdem interitum perpetuo alieno paruisse imperio.* This is the earliest instance of the usage heretofore cited by any modern writer. Note the close parallel between this sentence and that cited above from Livy.

Valer. Max. 9, 4, 1 Cum admodum locupleti L. Minucio Basilo falsum testamentum quidam in Graecia subiecisset eiusdemque confirmandi gratia potentissimos civitatis nostrae viros, M. Crassum et Q. Hortensium, quibus Minucius ignotus fuerat, tabulis heredes inseruisset, ...

(Although the reading of the Epitome Paridis is *eiusque,* there is no sufficient reason for altering the reading of this passage to *eius*[*dem*]*que*) ;

Valer. Max. 9, 13, Ext. 3 Hoc rege infelicior Alexander, cuius praecordia hinc amor hinc metus torserunt: nam cum infinito ardore coniugis Thebes teneretur, ad eandem ex epulis in cubiculum veniens barbarum conpunctum notis Thraciis stricto gladio inbebat anteire;

Curtius 7, 4, 27 Bactrianae terrae multiplex et varia natura est. Alibi multa arbor et vitis largos mitesque fructus alit . . . . Magnam deinde partem eiusdem terrae steriles harenae tenent;

Curtius 7, 4, 21 Ille cum clientium manu, qui non mutaverant fidem, Oxo amne superato exustisque navigiis, quibus transierat, ne iisdem hostis uteretur, novas copias in Sogdianis contrahebat.

This last sentence bears a general resemblance to the type of Cic. Tusc. disp. 4, 7, inasmuch as we might translate roughly 'that the boats might not be serviceable to the enemy also.' In this respect compare also the following sentence from Curtius 3, 12, 21

Virgines regias ('the daughters of Dareius') excellentis formae tam sancte habuit quam . . . . : coniugem eiusdem ('his wife *also*') . . . . non violavit;

Pliny, Epist. ad Traianum 18 (29) (*verba Traiani*) Provinciales, credo, prospectum sibi a me intelligent. Nam et tu dabis operam ut manifestum sit illis electum te esse, qui ad eosdem (*sic* Keil. ed. min. 1886; eas [dem] ed. mai.) mei loco mittereris;

Suetonius, Nero 6 . . . . missos (sc. esse homines) a Messalina uxore Claudii, qui eum. . . . strangularent. Additum fabulae, at eosdem dracone e pulvino se proferente conterritos refugisse (cf. Curtius 7, 4, 27 for the logical relation of the two sentences); Sulpicius Sev. 1, 19, 6 Levitas ad se gregavit eisdemque praecepit;

[Fredegar], Chron. 4, 76 Cumque anno xii regni Dagoberti eidem (i. e. Dagoberto) filius . . . . natus fuisset . . . .

The examples thus far cited appear to be fairly clear cases of *idem* in the sense of an anaphoric pronoun (when used with adjectival force it, of course, approaches close to the definite article). In the cases that follow there is observable a very marked falling off in the degree of intensity with which the element of identity comes out, but other elements are found associated with the word which remove it slightly from the class of the examples cited above.

Virgil, Aen. 4, 74-79 Nunc eadem (sc. Dido) labente die convivia quaerit.

The passage closely resembles Scrip. Hist. Aug. Pesc. Nig. ch. 10 f. Some interpret 'she again'; Georges, Wörtsbuch zu. d. Gedichten des V. s. v. says: "zur Bezeichnung der Einheit des subjects." I should be more inclined to assume that the general type of the context had most to do with bringing this particular word to Virgil's mind in this connection, than to attempt any very exact definitions of its meaning.

Cic. Tusc. disp. 5, 55 non quemvis hoc idem interrogarem;

Seneca, Epist. ad Lucil. 14, 2 (90), 22 'Receptas' inquit 'in os fruges concurrens inter se duritia dentium frangit, et quid quid excidit, ad eosdem dentes lingua refertur ('back to *the* teeth').

Tacitus, Dial. de orat. 21, 28 nisi forte quisquam aut Caesaris pro Decio Samnite aut Bruti pro Deiotaro rege ceterosque eisdem lenitudinis ac teporis libros legit, nisi qui et carmina *eorundem* miratur.

To these examples others might be added.

By the second or third century A. D. this use of *idem* had become quite common. The pagan authors who use it most frequently are Justin, the Scriptores Historiae Augustae and Ammianus Marcellinus. In Ammianus it occurs in this sense much more frequently than in other writers. There is a considerable number of cases in which the context does not make it clear whether *idem* has its normal classical sense or the weakened one; and the remaining instances, relatively few in number, are clear cases of the normal classical use. It is noticeable that even in Ammianus the nominative is infrequently found. The following selected examples show how complete is the transformation of the word in the time of Ammianus:

14, 11, 13 Quo cognito Constantius ultra mortalem modum exarsit ae nequo casu idem Gallus de futuris incertus agitare quaedam conducentia saluti suae per itinera conaretur . . . .;

14, 11, 34 Quae omnia si scire quisquam velit quam varia sint et adsidua, harenarum numerum idem iam desipiens et montium pondera scrutari putabit;

15, 5, 3 Dynamius quidam actuarius sarcinalium principis inmentorum commendaticias abeo petierat litteras ad amicos ut quasi familiaris eiusdem esset notissimus;

15, 8, 18 Deinde diebus paucis Helena virgine Constanti sorore eidem Caesari iugali foedere copulata . . . .;

21, 16, 12 . . . . virtutis erat potius indicium magnae, imperio eundem Constantium sine cruore cessisse quam vindicasse tam inclementer;

25, 6, 5 praeter unum exitum eundemque (= et eum) patentem; 23, 6, 69 haec eadem, fem.; 14, 6, 17 eandemque; 22, 16, 17 eādem; 18, 7, 5 eaedem; 22, 1, 1 earundem =? earum; 20, 11, 17 idem, nom. pl.; 20, 4, 5 eisdem, abl.; 24, 5, 11 idem, neut.; 20, 7, 16 eadem, neut.

Probably three fourths of the entire number of occurrences of *idem* in Ammianus represent the weakened force of the word. The cases which are doubtful or in which the element of identity is prominent are largely phrases expressing local or temporal relations; e. g. *eodem tempore* 14, 7, 7; *eisdem diebus* 14, 7, 8; 16, 7, 1; 16, 11, 8; 17, 7, 1; *eisdem in locis* 16, 2, 8; *in eisdem tractibus* 17, 8, 3; *in isdem castris,* 17, 9, 2; but (always?) *pari modo.*

Another noteworthy characteristic of Ammianus is the rarity with which *idem* is used modifying the same word with a demonstrative (*hic, ille* or *iste*). *Hic idem* still occurs now and then,[1] usually, to be sure, with attenuated force, but *idem ille* and *idem iste* are seldom (or never) met. The absence of the latter phrase is explained by the rarity with which *iste* is found in historical compositions,[2] Ammianus being no exception to the general rule; the absence of the former is explained by the fact that both *ille*

[1] Landgraf in his note on Reisig's Vorlesungen, p. 120, in which he corrects an error of Koziol (*hic idem* sei "nachklassisch") with the words "*hic idem* sagt schon Lucrez, ... dann Nigidius Figulus, Caecilius, Properz . . . ." appears not to realize that the collocation occurs upwards of twenty times in Plautus and Terence and nearly a hundred times in Cicero's Orations and Philosophical Works.

[2] See Meader, Lat. Pron. pp. 151 f.

and *idem* had become attenuated in meaning so that their functions approximated each other very closely and in consequence of this their use in conjunction would involve a redundancy.[1]

Those who wish to pursue the study of the usage in greater detail may consult the following passages:
Censorinus 7, 6; 13, 5; 22, 6.
Script. Hist. Aug. Did. Jul. 8, 8; Caracalla 4, 6; Ant. P. 2, 8; Albinus 10, 1; 10, 4; 1, 5; 6, 7; 8, 3; M. Aur. 23, 8; 24, 6; Avid. Cas. 4, 4 f.; Gallieni 3, 4 f.; 6, 8; < 12, 2; 12, 5>; 14, 4; 19 (= Salon. 1), 6; 21 (= 3), 5; xxx Tyr. 8, 3; 9, 4; 12, 14; 18, 11; Claudius 12, 3; Heliog. 2, 2; 10, 3; 24, 1-3; 25, 6; Alex. Sev. 12, 4; 18, 3; 19, 3 f.; 21, 4; 28, 2; 29, 2; 33, 2; 34, 4; 47, 1; 52, 1; Tacitus 9, 5; 11, 6 Probus 9, 1; 9, 2; 10, 1; 18, 6 ac ne requiras plura vel de Saturnino, vel de Proculo vel de Bonoso, suo eosdem inseram libro (cf. the common phrase *suo quemque*), pauca de isdem . . . . locuturus; Firmus 3, 3 (cf. 3, 4, *ipse quoque*); 3, 5; Pertinax 3, 9; Maximini 22, 1.
Victor, Epit. 36, 2.
De viris illustr. 2, 13; 23, 1; 43, 5.
Nepotianus, Epit. Val. Max. 7, 1; 8, 3 inter eosdem = Val. Max. 1, 7, 3 inter eos; 15, 18.
Justin 1, 2, 10; 1, 4, 3; 1, 4, 11; 1, 6, 1; 1, 6, 5; 1, 6, 8; 1, 10, 5; 1, 10, 7; 1, 10, 10; 2, 4, 24 (?); 2, 9, 5; 2, 10, 13; 2, 13, 3; 3, 6, 4; 5, 1, 11; 5, 10, 5; 7, 1, 9; 7, 5, 5; 9, 7, 11; 10, 3, 5; etc., etc., 32, 1, 8, 38, 3, 1.
Gellius 3, 9, 4.
Hist. Apoll. Reg. Tyr. 50 eodem || *v. l. eo* ||.
Lex Puteolana (Bruns, Fontes p. 273); Obligatio Hispal. (Bruns p. 290).

[1] The collocation *is idem* seems not to occur earlier than Aulus Gellius, and perhaps not even in his works. Even in later times it is of extreme rarity.

Pompeius, In Donat. 98, 24 (K).
Minuc. Felix 21, 1.
Cyprian, Epist. 41, 2*e;* De bon. pat. 19*m.*
Cassianus, Inst. 4, 6; 4, 3, 4; Conlat. 8, 18, 2; 10, 7, 2; 15, 6, 2; 20, 1, 3; 23, 5, 4; 24, 9, 4.
Commodian 1, 18, 8.
Priscil. p. 111, 17.
Lucifer Calar. De reg. apost. 1 (p. 37, 31); 8 (p. 55, 28); 10 (p. 58, 15).
Epist. Constantini ad episcopos cathol. in Ziwsa's ed. of Optatus p. 209, 19; cf. p. 210, 6; 210, 9; Epist. Constantini de basilica . . . . *ed. cit.* p. 214, 7; 216, 1.
Sulpic Sev. 1, 3, 2; 1, 5, 6; 1, 15, 1; 1, 22, 3; 1, 53, 5; 1, 52, 3; 2, 30, 2; 2, 41, 1; 2, 43, 1; M. 22, 6; D. 1, 15, 7 etc. See Lönnergren.
Paul. Diac. Hist. Long. 4, 37 (= Gesta Rom. 49).
Argumentum II. ad Plaut. Mil. Glor. line 3.
Edictum Maximini *apud* Luc. Caecil. De mort. pers. 34, 2 parentes eorundorum (= Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 8, 17, 3 *οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῶν*).
Jordanes, Get. 2.
Other examples may be found in St. Augustine, Lactantius, Philastrius, Corippus, Eugippus, and especially in Bede's Hist. Eccl. Gentis Angl.

Val. Max. 1, 1, 5 is a doubtful passage: *At Sulpicio inter sacrificandum e capite apex prolapsus eidem sacerdotium abstulit.* Eidem is the reading of all the manuscripts. Lipsius proposed *idem,* agreeing with *sacerdotium* and meaning 'this same,' i. e. the *flaminium,* which is mentioned in the preceding sentence. This reading would, of course, restore *idem* to its normal classical force. The manuscript reading involves, to be sure, what the grammarian would call a redundancy, yet a very slight one in comparison with many others which are accepted without

question by editors (see *is* used redundantly in Cato, De agr. 8, 1 Ficos . . . . *Africanas, Herculaneas, Sacontinas, hibernas, tellanas atras pediculo longo,* eas *in loco crassiore et stercorato serito*). *Is* is quite commonly so used after an intervening relative clause; e. g. Cic. Tusc. disp. 3, 71 *Id quod . . . . id hi . . . . reppulerunt;* Vitruvius p. 226, 17 (R). In English such common expressions as "John he did it," much more "redundant" than this, are familiar to all, not to mention the established French usage *la mort, est-elle un mal.* Since the use of *idem* in the sense of *is* is established for Valerius, there would seem to be no strong ground for altering the text. The sentence falls into two halves: *At . . . . prolapsus* and *eidem . . . . abstulit;* the first is the cause, the second the effect; each half is so distinctly apperceived as group, that the pronoun in the second referring to an antecedent in the first is as natural as the English expression "*S's* apex falling from *his* head deprived *him* of *his* priestly office."

Another large group of cases of doubtful interpretation are those in which the pronoun *idem* stands as an antecedent of the relative pronoun. Such cases have been omitted from the above discussion, because in them the situation rarely makes it clear whether *idem* has merely a correlative force or retains its earlier element of identity. Certain it is that the relative clause, adjoining, as it commonly does, a second predicate to the antecedent of the relative pronoun, will of itself contribute to the expression of the idea of identity, and the part it thus plays will vary as greatly as that played by the various types of coordinate clauses discussed on pp. 69-70 above. In some types of relative clauses there must have been a tendency on the part of *idem* to depart from its earlier force and become associated with the correlative function,—a tendency which must have been facilitated by the gradual shifting of *idem*

to the meaning of *is* in its other uses. In fact it should cause no surprise to find *idem* completely fused with the relative in meaning, just as *is* did, when in the form *eo* it coalesced so completely with *quod*, that after *quod, quia* and *quoniam* took on the usage *dico quod* (*quia, etc.*) *es(se)t*, in the sense of *dico esse, eoquod* appears in the same function, e. g. S. Silvia, Peregrin. 8, 5 *retulit eoquod* 'he reported that'; Gospel of Mark 9, 26 (25) ὥστε . . . . λέγειν ὅτι ἀπέθανεν which appears in the Cod. Veronensis *b ut . . . . diceret eoquod mortuus esset.* Italian *desso* may represent a similar fusion.

Along with the shift in meaning just described goes another, which consists in the gradual transfer of the word from the rank of a predominating element of the sentence to that of a subordinate element. This accounts in part for the fact, that in the great majority of instances *idem* in its attenuated sense stands in an oblique case, most commonly in the genitive but also in the dative and less frequently in the accusative, the predominating element of the sentence usually being the logical subject and so commonly coinciding with the grammatical subject. This subject finds its expression in substantive form in the sentence preceding that containing *idem,* and usually no special words are needed to indicate that the subject is continued in the second sentence, unless for some special reason the attention is very sharply directed to it, as in Cic. Acad. 2, 105 *ea, quae vos 'percipi comprehendique,' eadem nos, si modo probabilia sint, 'videri' dicimus.* This very emphasis on the subject, however, precludes the use of the attenuated *idem* in connection with it. The usage of *same* in English and *derselbe* in German in the function of an anaphoric pronoun shows the same general tendency in so far as the characteristic features of modern

syntax do not interfere. So in English, out of quite a large number of examples collected by the writer, three fourths are prepositional phrases. Nearly all the remaining cases are accusatives, there being only one subject nominative among them. The following examples will show how closely the English usage resembles the Latin:

"We do not carry this book in stock. If you can wait for same, we will cable."—Business letter. (A very common usage.)

"The demands of purely technical studies or those bearing immediately upon the same have rendered, etc."—H. C. Sadler, in School Review.

"As the diplomatist regards his work as the most important thing under the light of heaven, it would be better if there were no public sentiment. It interferes with the same."—Detroit Free Press editorial.

"But the second named class of orders shall not in any fiscal year exceed the aggregate taxes levied in such year for the payment of the same."—Ann Arbor City Charter.

"These also imply the Epitome as source; so there were perhaps variant versions of the same."—Univ. of Mich. Stud. vol. 1, p. 166.

"From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same."—Psalm 153.

Correlated with a relative:

> "Well, tell me now, what lady is the same
> To whom you swore a secret pilgrimage?"
>
> —Merch. of Venice I, i.

Subject of the sentence:

"In this mine the veins are only three feet thick, and the workman has a much harder time to get out the coal than where the same is thicker."—Newspaper item.

The English usage is still a living one in the colloquial

language, of America at least, although there is a common impression that it is archaic. It may not be often met with in contemporary *belles lettres;* and in the legal language and the Bible it does have a formal tone. But such a tone of formalism is certainly not associated with the word in ordinary colloquial (conversational) language, nor in newspaper articles and advertisements. Nor is it likely that, as has been suggested, the German usage has had any important influence on it. It is possible that, as others have supposed, the frequent use of the prepositional phrases *of the same, with the same,* etc., at the close of a clause or a sentence (in nearly all cases they do occupy that position) is due to the feeling of the impropriety of using such a "light" ending for a sentence as *of it, with it,* etc., although I should not attach much importance to that influence either. In fact, we may legitimately inquire whether this very feeling is not based in part upon the fact that the use of the phrases *of the same, thereof,* etc., has become so general at the close of a sentence.

The use of *derselbe* differs from that of *the same* mainly in its wider range and greater universality. In fact, the "determinative" use of *derselbe* is the prevailing one in most parts of Germany, the use of the word to express identity being confined to certain types of context, as stated above. In Bavaria, where *der nämliche* is in general use instead of *derselbe,* the former also has passed into the attenuated use (see Schmeller, Bayr. Wörterbuch vol. I, Sp. 1741), just as *ipse* passed into the attenuated use at the same time that it came into use as a pronoun of identity. In general the usage of *derselbe* corresponds fairly closely to that of *idem* in so far as the genitive, dative and accusative with and without prepositions are more frequent; yet the nominative is also in general use, as, for example, in Schanz, Röm. Litt. I², 219 Allein abgesehen davon,

dass diese Ansicht zu einer Hypothese greifen muss, befindet sich dieselbe, auch nicht Einklang mit den Worten des Epigrammisten.

Concomitant with the shift of *idem* from a pronoun of identity to a determinative we find other expressions coming into more and more frequent use to represent the concept of identity. Their rise is to be taken in a certain limited sense as proof of the shift of *idem*. First of these expressions was *is ipse*, a quasi composite expression formed of the same type of elements as *idem* itself, the force of *ipse* not differing greatly from the earlier force of *-em*. The rise and development of this expression and of *hic ipse* is discussed in The Latin Pronouns pp. 168-170. A second and still more intense expression was *idem ipse*. On the use of the phrase in Cicero see above pp. 41-44. After Cicero it appears first in Aulus Gellius. Possibly its absence from the intervening literature is due to that same diligence which editors have displayed in their attempts to eradicate it from the text of Cicero. In Gellius 1, 6, 3 *easdemque ipsas* 'and even these' occurs, where Cicero would have written *easque ip.* or *illasque ip.;* 2, 8, 3 *tunc deinde eodem ipso, quod amiserat, quasi posito concessoque ad confirmandum aliud utitur,* where *eodem ipso,* correlated with the relative pronoun, means 'the very (same)'; 4, 6, 4 *super eodem ipso verbo requiri audio;* 11, 13, 5 *cum eadem ipsa verba saepius . . . . lectitarentur* 'the same words'; 12, 2, 11 *iam verborum Senecae piget . . . .* (12) *Dignus tamen Seneca videatur lectione ac studio adulescentium . . . .* (13) *Audias tamen commemorari ac referri pauca quaedam, quae idem ipse Seneca bene dixerit.* Note that in the last passage this expression also has a slightly attenuated force.

Censorinus 11, 4 Nam eum (the number six) telion Graeci, nos autem perfectum vocamus, quod eius partes, sexta, tertia et dimidia, id est unus et duo et tres, eundem ipsum perficiunt;

Minucius Felix 34, 4 (citing pagan authorities to establish the view that a cataclysm will finally destroy the earth) Stoicis constans opinio est, quod consumto umore mundus hic omnis ignescat. Et Epicureis de elementorum conflagratione et mundi ruina eadem ipsa sententia est;

Augustine Epist. 28 (ad Hieronymum) ingressi sunt ad me idem ipsi, quos audieram;

also correlated with a relative pronoun in Script. Hist. Aug. xxx Tyr. 23, 4 *ab isdem ipsis, a quibus* and Boeth. De consol. phil. 2 pr. 63 (relative clause precedes; *v. l. id ipsum*);

Pastor Hermae, Sim 9, 1, 2 *νῦν δὲ ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου βλέπεις, διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μὲν πνεύματος, Versio Palat.* Nunc vero per nuntium vides, per eundem ipsum spiritum, *versio Vulg.* Nunc autem per nuncium adlustraris, per eundem quidem spiritum.

It is evident in this passage that the translator of the *Vulgata* has followed the Greek text with painstaking accuracy, but that the translator of the later version has made more allowance for variation between the Greek and Latin idiom.

The following passage illustrates how *idem ipsum,* after coming into common use, took on the quasi conjunctional force previously developed by *idem:* Adamnanus, De locis sanctis 2, 3 (= p. 257, 4 G):

Nostro salvatore . . de quo propheta canit: "qui eduxit aquam de petra" et apostolus Paulus: "Petra autem erat Christus" qui de . . . . petra . . . . produxit undam. idem ipse est dei virtus et dei sapientia . . . 'he is also.'

Parallel is Jordanes, Get. 121 tamen tunc omnes Hermanarici imperiis servierunt. Aestorum quoque similiter nationem, qui longissimam ripam Oceani Germanici insident, idem ipse prudentia et virtute subegit.

Here, of course, the cumulative force is heightened by the use of *quoque similiter. Eodem ipso* with much attenuated force occurs in Nepotiani Epit. Val. Max. 8, 7 *Alexander Magnus quiescens se interfici Cassandri dextra vidit. Eodem ipso postea insidias ordinante bibit venenum.*

Finally we should note in this connection the collocation *in ipsa atque in eadem:* Firmilianus Epist. ad Cyprianum 75, 1 (=p. 810, 7 H):

Gratias .... Deo egimus, quod contigerit, ut qui corpore .... separamur, sic spiritu adunemur quasi non unam tantum regionem tenentes, sed in ipsa atque in eadem domo simul inhabitantes.

The emotional tone of this sentence is unusually strong, while the contrasts between *separamur* and *adunemur* and between *non unam .... tenentes* and *in ipsa .... inhabitantes* show clearly with what intensity the concept of *identity* predominates in this sentence and afford a plain enough explanation of the reduplication of the symbol of identity.

On the use of *ipse* not associated with *is* or *idem* as a symbol of identity see above pp. 37 ff. *Par* and *unus* are discussed on pp. 11, 56 ff. Individual writers differ considerably in the preference they show for one or another of these words. Compare, for example, Valer. Max. 1, 8 Ex. 17

Polystratus et Hippoclides philosophi, eodem die nati, eiusdem praeceptoris Epicuri sectam secuti, patrimonii etiam possidendi habendaeque scholae communione coniuncti eodemque momento temporis ultima senectute extincti

with Nepotianus 9, 28

Polystratus et Hippoclides et uno die nati sunt et ambo Epicurei fuerunt, communibus usi discipulis sunt et patrimoniis eodemque momento sunt mortui.

Some writers use *ipse* and *is ipse* in cases where *idem* no longer serves; but Ammianus Marcellinus shows a more decided preference for *par.*

In addition to the reinforced expressions *idem ipse* and *unus et idem* (see pp. 20-22) we find cases of *par et idem* and *par idem.* Early examples are infrequent. The rea-

son appears to lie not in the fact that the expressions are redundant, but in a certain contradiction of meaning involved; for *idem* is found in cases in which the two or more objects originally conceived as different have, as a result of comparison, more or less completely fused, while *par* is found in association with such as are held distinctly apart, though having their qualities for the most part otherwise identical. In Cicero's Pro Murena 21 all the manuscripts except G read *Summa in utroque* (sc. *Servio et Murena*) *est honestas, summa dignitas; quam ego, si mihi per Servium liceat, pari atque in eadem* || *eadem in* cod. Lg. 26 || *laude ponam.* Bake's conjecture *parem* seems here almost certainly to represent the original meaning. The assimilation of *parem* to the case of *eadem* is a very natural error for a copyist. The position of *in* in the MSS. militates against *pari.* If *pari atque eadem in* was the original reading then *eadem* may be taken as a correction (or modification) of *pari* 'in like and in fact the same.' *Laude* being here conceived as a standard of measurement easily admits this interpretation. The passage is closely paralleled by Caes. Bell. Gall. 5, 16, 3 *Equestris autem proelio ratio et cedentibus et insequentibus par atque idem periculum inferebat.* The passage may be defended on the same basis as that of Cicero. On the whole it is more likely that the use of the two words is rather to be regarded as due to a desire to express the idea of identity with greater intensity rather than a desire to express two very slightly differing forms of the same. From this point of view the passage can be no more justly impugned as tautological than the phrase *unus et idem.* Tittler, Jahrb. Class. Phil. vol. 81 (1860), p. 506 would omit the whole sentence as a gloss on the ground that it repeats a thought already expressed in § 2 and is omitted by the *editio princeps* and some of the manuscripts. The phrase finds some support in the

nearly synonymous phrase occurring in Bell. Gall. 7, 74, 1 *paris eiusdemque generis munitiones* and in Sil. Ital. 15, 397

Alterius par atque eadem fortuna laborum Consulis.

Still later comes Arnobius 3, 27*p* with *pari atque eadem ratione,* which had already been prepared for by the frequently recurring phrases *pari ratione, pari modo, eodem modo* (*ratione*) and which is paralleled by a similar phrase in Cic. Pro Sulla 5 *Intelliges et de hoc et de aliis iudicium meum et horum par atque unum fuisse;* Lactantius, Divin. Inst. 5, 13, 2 (= p. 439, 16 Br.)

Cruciari . . . . malunt, cum possint ex eo ipso pervidere non esse stultitians in quam tanta hominum milia per orbem totum una et pari mente consentiant,

5, 13, 5 (= p. 440, 3) Cum . . . . omnis sexus, omnis aetas et gens et regio unis (note the plural) ac paribus animis deo serviat, eadem sit ubique patientia, idem contemtus mortis;

Ammian. Marcel. 20, 4, 17 Conclamabatur post haec ex omni parte nihilo minus, uno parique ardore nitentibus universis . . . . Caesar adsentire coactus est;

cf. 24, 1, 1 Post exploratam alacritatem exercitus, uno parique ardore inpetrabilem principem superari non posse, deum usitato clamore testati . . . .;

25, 7, 3 uno parique natatu quingenti viri transgressi tumidum flumen incolumes . . .

Finally there is a noteworthy passage in Plautus, Bacch. 1109

Nicobulus. Philoxene, salve. Ph. Et tu, unde agis? N. Unde homo miser atque infortunatus.
Ph. At pol ego ibi sum, ubi miserum hominem decet atque infortunatum.
N. Igitur pari fortuna, aetate ut sumus, utimur. Ph. Sic est. Sed tu,
Quid Tibist? N. Pol mihi par idemst quod tibi.

There is no variation in the manuscripts, but the peculiar and unusual collocation has led to various emendations. Ussing's view that it is ridiculous to regard *par idem* as equivalent to *par adque adeo idem,* seems to me sound, but the retention of the manuscript reading does not necessarily involve this interpretation. It is clear that Nicobulus wishes to express the exact correspondence (parallelism) of their cases, and that he wishes to express it forcibly. The parallelism is expressed by *par* and the emphasis is secured by the *idem,* which in this case represents form (2) (p. 5). The phrase from this point of view is no more redundant and no more objectionable than *idem unum* in Poenulus 13

> Nam omnibus amicis meis idem unum convenit
> Ut me suspendam, ne addicar Agorastocli.

This is the reading of A, and that to which B, C and D clearly point. It is no more tautological than *unum et idem, the very identical,* or *ganz ebenso.* Its isolation forms no sound basis for condemning it.

In my book on the Latin pronouns I have discussed the use of *hic* as a determinative in certain types of context on pp. 35-79, the corresponding use of *ipse* on pp. 184-190, of *iste* on pp. 159-161 and briefly touched on the use of *ille* in the same function on pp. 193-195. It is thus made clear, that all five of these pronouns became attenuated to the mere determinative (often merely anaphoric) function, chiefly through the gradual disappearance of the demonstrative element in their meaning. The changes were going on in all of these words contemporaneously. Not, of course, that the shift began in all at the same time or was completed in all simultaneously. *Iste,* for example, in classical Latin symbolizes a distinctly stronger deictic force than *ille* or *hic;* that is to say, all in all, in its pre-

vailing usage, it has a stronger force, i. e. its emotional "content" is more intense, while in their general usage *ille* and *hic* are weaker, although now and then, especially in poetry, they appear with strong demonstrative force. The earliest example of *iste* in a sense approaching the determinative is Celsus 8, 12 (= p. 354, 16 D), but even this relatively late example is not a perfectly clear case, and on the whole instances of much attenuated *iste* are seldom met in the literature of the first century A. D. While the date of the first appearance of a usage in a literary work is, to be sure, no certain criterion of the time of its first appearance in the language, yet, in the absence of other evidence, we may take the chronological relations of the above pronouns as revealed in the literature as rough indications of their colloquial relations. It would seem that an exception should be made in the case of *iste,* because *iste* being a pronoun of the second person must have found much more frequent usage in the spoken than in the literary language. Still, as a matter of fact, the Romance languages (cf. Italian *questo* "this") show that the development of *iste* into a determinative was not in accordance with the prevailing tendency of the word. So even in this case the literary evidence seems to point toward the real truth.

If *iste* was the last of the pronouns to follow this line of development, *ipse* was next in order. Examples of *ipse* in this sense are found in Catullus and Varro. (See The Latin Pronouns, p. 186.) This difference of perhaps eighty years should not be taken too seriously. Of much greater moment is the fact that while in later Latin instances of *iste* = *is* are not at all common, the use of *ipse* in this sense becomes more and more frequent, possibly under some considerable influence from the Greek αὐτός. In fact in some writers, for example Justin and several of the Church

Fathers, it becomes extremely common. Here too the testimony of the Romance languages confirms that of the literature, for *ipsum* is the immediate progenerator of Ital. *esso* 'it, he,' *essa* 'it, she.' Increasing frequency of this usage is in part accounted for by the fact that two lines of development converge toward this one function; because *ipse* passed on the one hand from the intensive force '*self*,' to this function and on the other hand from the meaning 'same' to this function; thus

ipse = 'self' > ipse = 'he.'
ipse = 'same' > ipse = 'he.'

On the probable interrelation of the meanings 'self' and 'same' see above, p. 52. The evidence of literary Latin appears to point clearly in the direction of the double development, the two usages 'same' and 'he, she, it' occurring about simultaneously. Too much weight should therefore not be laid on Ascoli's words (Archivio Glottologico Italiano xv, p. 314) *La scarsa funzione aggettivale di esso è pure nel senso, benchè attenuato, del pronome d'identità.* The vague phrase *benchè attenuato,* gives very wide latitude to the meaning of the sentence. In Spanish (and elsewhere, according to Ascoli, pp. 303-316) special connotations have become associated with the word, meanings of which there appears to be no trace in imperial Latin. These connotations are to some extent at least incompatible with the concept of identity and scarcely to be sought for in association with it.

Hic had taken on the determinative function even before Cicero's day, and *ille* as early as Plautus. The order of succession was therefore *ille, hic, ipse, iste.* But while they were all in use as determinatives during the imperial period it does not follow that they were identical in meaning. *Iste,* for example, almost invariably connoted some

idea of the moral qualities, the importance, worth, etc., of the object represented by the word it modified; and it is not reasonable to suppose that these connotations were always entirely wanting when the word was used as a determinative. *Ipse* likewise developed an association with the person addressed, which gave it too a special coloring. The same is true in a less degree of *hic* and *ille,* and although these two words, especially *hic,* had many points of contact with *is* (see The Latin Pronouns chap. I), yet there were numerous types of construction and special phrases in which one or the other pronoun appeared to the exclusion of the rest. Thus while the general tendency of all was more or less strongly in one direction, there were such numerous minor distinctions between them that each filled a special set of needs. To follow out these differences in detail would be an interesting and perhaps valuable piece of work, for which the extant texts offer abundant material. In the end *idem* entirely disappeared, *hic* survived in the form of Italian *cio* (=*ecce* + *hoc*), but has a very restricted use, chiefly in the phrases *cioè* and *cio che,* which two words, like *eoquod* seem to have closely fused. *Iste* developed into a determinative chiefly through the intermediate stage of a demonstrative of the first person, cf. French *cette* and Italian *questo,* while *ille,* the earliest of all (except, of course, *is*) to show this meaning, has maintained itself most widely (geographically) and most extensively (in range of usage) of all.

With reference to *idem* it is safe to say that, as the determinative developed out of the idea of identity, it must have been confined for the most part to the anaphoric and (in connection with the relative pronoun) the correlative functions. As *ipse, hic* and *ille* were all used in these functions, the extent to which *idem* was used was considerably narrowed down. Add to this the consideration that

the concept of identity is one that occurs far less frequently than those of time and space, and we have before us the most important reasons why *idem* in later years gradually disappeared from the language. Valuable light is thrown upon the usage of *idem* in northern France in the seventh and eighth centuries of the Christian era by a comparison of the two Lives of Saint Balthildis already mentioned. Nowhere does the word *idem* occur in the original Vita. In the revised version it appears seventeen times. The forms occurring are *idem* (*v. l. isdem*) *eadem, eiusdem, eidem, eundem, eandem, eādem, eorundem.* In none of these cases does the context call unequivocally for the interpretation 'same.' In fact, in the only passage in which the idea of identity occurs (p. 497, 18 = chap. 11 *extr.*), *unus* is used in both versions. In eight cases the reviser has used *idem* in entirely new matter which he has added to the Life; in five cases he has altered an original *ipse* to *idem* (pp. 485, 8; 485, 19; 486, 28; 499, 3; 502, 15); in one case he has changed *ei* to *eidem* (p. 484, 22); in the other three cases he has used a form of *idem* in connection with slight verbal changes of the original where the original has no pronoun. In all seventeen cases Cicero would probably have used some form of *is*. As the original author possessed little scholastic learning (cf. prologue: *imperitia denegat vires delicatae historiae scolasticorumque verborum ordinem proferendi*), and as the verbal changes introduced by the reviser are consistently in the interest of better "grammar," we are warranted in concluding that *idem* had already taken on the character of a distinctly "literary" word, and had presumably largely passed out of use in the vernacular of the original author of the Life. He uses for the most part two pronouns, *is* and *ipse*. He uses *ipse* upwards of seventy times, about forty-five times as subject nominative; he uses *is* about sixty times, never

as subject nominative (nor does the plural *hi* occur), but mostly in the genitive (*eius* and *eorum*), much less often in the accusative and dative. The form *id* (nominative and accusative) has largely given place to *hoc; id* occurring only twice (once in the conventional phrase *id est*), while of the pronoun *hic* other forms than *hoc* occur but twice in the entire Life; these forms are *hac* and *hanc*. The prevalence of the nominatives *ipsa* and *ipse*, the genitives *eius* and *eorum*, the neuter nominative and accusative *hoc* is characteristic of other late Latin writings and a good start in those directions had already been made in Cicero's day. *Iste* occurs but once in the Vita; forms of *ille* only six times, including the two adverbs *illuc* and *illic*. Both the original author and the reviser appeared to have lived in the vicinity of Paris, so that the differences between the two can hardly be taken as divergencies between the dialects of two localities.

Among the many elements of thought and feeling with which in their various forms *idem* was associated attention has been called in the preceding pages to the following three: (1) the element of identity; (2) the consciousness that the concept represented by *idem* is occurring in a new set of relationships different from those in which it occurs elsewhere (perhaps more than once) either in the same or an adjacent unit of thought (sentence);[1] (3) the relational element, which is the consciousness, more or less distinctly realized, of the nature of the relationship existing between the two or more sets of relationships in which

[1] Anaphoric *idem* and correlative *idem* are terms used by the grammarians to describe special types of this general usage. The word *determinative* is often applied to it in both these forms,—so in Lane's Latin Grammar.

the concept[1] occurs, as described above. These three elements are not mutually exclusive, they may *all* be component parts of the same concept but in the innumerable number of concepts which *idem* represented they were present with varying degrees of intensity (or prominence). In any given usage of *idem* one of them quite invariably predominates over the others, i. e. absorbs the greater share of the speaker's attention, the other elements being more or less neglected. If we represent these three elements by *i, d,* and *r* respectively (using *n* to represent *all* other elements found in a given instance), while we employ capital letters to indicate predominating elements and enclose all non-predominating elements in parentheses, we may represent (1), the prevailing classical usage of *idem* by the formula *I* (*r d n*); (2), that discussed in detail on pp. 65 ff. above by *D* (*r i n*) or *D* (*ʀ i n*);[2] (3), the relational usages by *R* (*d i n*) or *R* (*d n*) or in its extreme form *R* (*n*),—this last is an extreme form in which there is no trace of the determinative element or the element of identity. The range of usage exemplified by Cic. De amicitia 65 *est enim boni viri, quem eundem sapientem licet dicere, haec duo tenere in amicitia* corresponds to the formula *I* (*ʀ d n*), being an intermediate form between (1) and (3).

Type (or usage) (3) remains to be discussed.[3] We may deal with it the more briefly inasmuch as it has been

[1] It is, of course, in reality a different concept which occurs in each of the various situations, but the speaker is at the moment of the formulation of the sentence more distinctly conscious of the likenesses between them than of the differences; so that we may loosely speak of them as "one concept recurring."

[2] *ʀ* indicated a lesser degree of predominance than *R*.

[3] This usage is traditionally, though very inaccurately called the adverbial usage.

discussed by E. H. Sturtevant in Classical Philology, vol. 2 (1907), pp. 313-323.

We have attempted to show in the preceding pages how *idem* in the various special forms of the type of sentence described on p. 69 above came to be associated with the range of concepts that were associated in classical Latin chiefly with *is*. In this same general type of context but in a variety of forms somewhat different from those just referred to, *idem* came to be associated with the relational element. It is patent that in various sentences of this type the concept found in the two relationships may or may not predominate over the other elements of the sentence, and that when it does predominate, the degree of predominance will vary in the different instances of its occurrence. The degree in which the concept thus predominates determines (or conditions) in part (sometimes in large part) which one of the elements of that concept itself will predominate over the other elements of it. In cases of marked predominance of the concept the element of identity will commonly be felt with considerable distinctness. In these cases we find in Cicero and Caesar some word or words, e. g. *idem, quem eundem, is ipse, hic ipse,* etc., which clearly bring out this element. We have seen above how the occurrence of an innumerable number of degrees of predominance of the element of identity led to the establishment of a close association of *idem* with concepts which did not contain the element at all, but in which the anaphoric or determinative element predominated. If now it is not the concept found in the two or more situations that predominates, but if the attention centers upon these situations themselves, we have the conditions necessary for the shifting roughly indicated by the formula *idem* > *item;* for in this instance the relations between the two situations come out with more or less distinctness. This shift also

is made possible by the existence of innumerable intermediate stages, such as De amicitia 65, between the two extremes. It is also essential that the "antecedent" of *idem* be a non-predominating element. It may be noted in passing that *idem* failed to pass into the meaning *tamen, nihilominus,* etc., for the reason the very sharp contrast between the two relationships in which the common concept is placed is ordinarily accompanied by a distinct realization of the *sameness* of the concept in the two or more situations. This element consequently does not sink to the rank of a non-predominating element. Furthermore, if the attention does center *very* strongly upon these two situations, we are likely to have a sentence of the isolating type[1] in which no particular word is found expressing the nature of the relationship.[2]

But, to return to *idem* > *item,* it is clear that this shift and the other one, *idem* > *is,* went on side by side, and doubtless with more or less interdependence. Common to the two is, at least, the sinking of the element of identity to the rank of a non-dominating element. The type of context under discussion must be carefully distinguished from its exact opposite in which two concepts (persons or things) entirely different (i. e. felt by the speaker as entirely different) are represented in the same situation.[3] The second concept is in classical Latin usually represented

[1] Compare Boucke, Jl. of Germanic Phil. vol. 4 (1902), pp. 397 f.

[2] Compare the frequency with which adversative conjunctions are "omitted" in such sentences as Cic. De nat. deor. 3, 88 *fortunam a deo petendam, a se ipso sumendam esse sapientiam* and Sallust, Cat. 52, 6 *non agitur de vectigalibus neque de sociorum iniuriis: libertas et anima nostra in dubio est.*

[3] See Kühner, op. cit. p. 460, Anm. 17: "wenn eine Bestimmung zwei Gegenständen ertheilt wird."

by *ipse* and *et ipse* (later by *ipse quoque*). After *ipse* came to be closely associated with the element of identity and with the anaphoric or determinative element (both of which shifts went on in the word simultaneously[1]) it also took on the relational element in the same type of context in which *idem* took it on; e. g. Minucius Felix 1, 4 *sic solus in amoribus conscius, ipse socius in erroribus;* cf. Continuator Marcellini 536, 6 (p. 104 Mommsen) *Theodatum occidit* (sc. *Vitigis*) . . . . *et ipse subsequitur per Tusciam omnes opes Theodati diripiens.* Jordanes, Rom. 283 *hic* (sc. *Philippus*) *etenim filium suum idem Philippum consortem regni fecit ipseque primus omnium imperatorum Christianus effectus est* admits of the same interpretation. It is only *after* the shift of *idem* into association with the concept *R* (*d n*) that it can occur in the "*et ipse*" type of context as in the two examples cited by Sturtevant, p. 319:

25. (=C. I. L. vi, 27556.) Pupus Torquatianus filius bonus qui semper parentibus obsequens vixit annis viii m(ensibus) viiii d(iebus) xiii, item alius pupus Laetianus qui IDEM fil(ius) bonus et obsequens idem parentibus vixit annis, etc.
26. (=C. I. L. xi, 1074.) T. Al(fio?) Ecetio posuerunt servi quos educav(i)t, isde(m) liberta et servi[2] . . . .

---

[1] See Meader, Lat. Pron. chap. 4.

[2] I fail to detect the essential difference between these two sentences which Mr. Sturtevant appears to have found. To my mind thy are essentially parallel in thought: 25 'Torquatianus was a good son, likewise was Laetianus'; 26 'the slaves set up the monument, likewise the freedwoman,' etc. (i. e. cooperated in its erection—the statement is not accurately made). Similarly I see no essential difference between Nos. 3 and 24 (cited below). In the latter 'Fuscus built the temple and likewise dedicated it,' in the former Licinia Fortunata is represented as a *liberta* and likewise as a wife. The general situation appears to me to be the most important factor that

In these two sentences *idem* does not emphasize the identity of the second predicate with the preceding so much as it represents the speaker's recognition of the fact that Fuscus is found in the second situation as well as in the first. Just herein lies the resemblance between this type of context and the *et ipse* type; for the parallelism between these two sets of relationships is the same as the parallelism between the facts that Torquatianus is a good son and that Laetianus is a good son.

In a like manner there is no essential difference between the types of context in Cic. De off. 2, 10 *quicquid enim iustum sit, id etiam utile esse censent, itemque quod honestum, idem iustum, ex quo efficitur, ut, quicquid honestum sit, idem sit utile*[1] on the one hand and the following cases cited by Mr. Sturtevant:

1. (=C. I. L. VI, 15389) Dis Manib(us). Claudiae Cypare fecit Claudius Felix libertae suae piissimae idem coniugi et sibi.

4. (=C. I. L. VI, 16534*b*) Dis Man(ibus). Cn. Cossutius Cladus. Cn. Cossutius Agathangelus patri suo isdem[2] liberto bene merenti fecit.

6. (=C. I. L. XIV, 439) L. Voluseio (mulieris) l(iberto) Dio, seviro Augustal(i) idem quinquennal(i)

8. (=C. I. L. XIV, 318) D(is) M(anibus) L. Carulli Felicissimi bis(elliarii) (sevirl) Aug(ustalis idem) q(uin) q(uennalis) L(aurentis) L(avinatis) . . . .

12. (=C. I. L. XIV, 2112) . . . . L. Caesennio L. f(ilio) Quir(lna) Rufo dict(atore) III idemq(ue) patr(ono) . . . .

24. (=C. I. L. VI, 589) Silvano sacr(um). Cn. Antonius Cn. f(ilius) Fuscus aediculum cum ara et cratera d(ono) d(edit) idemque dedicavit.

---

determines the "meaning" of *idem*, the particular grammatical form into which they are cast appears secondary and less essential.

[1] Bracketed in Müller's ed. of 1898.

[2] Equivalent to *idem*.

In 1 and 4 *idem* had become so completely associated with the concept *R* (*n*) that it is possible only by a most strained interpretation to take it as a nominative singular. Note that it is Claudia and Cladius (referred to by *fratri*) who are represented each in the two relations, so that even if it were possible to speak of *idem* as having an "antecedent," we could not thus establish its character as nominative. To attempt this is to lay undue stress upon the grammatical form. There is no lack of instances in the literature, in which, as in Nos. 6, 8 and 12, it is not possible to construe *idem* as a nominative, e. g.

[Fredegar], Chron. 4, 81 (= p. 162, 5 Kr.) idem eius tempore gravissime a Sarracinis vastatur imperium.

Jordanes, Rom. 39 et sic . . . . regnaverunt post Latinum Aeneas et successores eius, qui et Silvii Albanique sunt vocitati, pro Albano urbe et pro postumo Aeneae idem Enea || *vv. ll.* aenea eidem enea; aenea eiusdem e., which last is clearly a correction ||;

Rom. 283 hic (sc. Philippus) etenim filium suum idem || *v. l.* id est || Philippum consortem regni fecit, ipseque . . . .;

Get. 89 Philippo . . . . regnante . . . . qui solus ante Constantinum Christianus cum Philippo idem filio fuit || *vv. ll. p.* id est f.; p. idem philippo; p. eiusdem filio ||;

Gregory of Tours, Hist. Franc. 1, 8 Primus Esau, qui Edom, *id est* || *v. l.* idem || terrenus;

Vita S. Radegundis 1, 2 (= Mon. Ger. Hist. Scr. Merov. vol. 2, p. 371, 10) Item || *vv. ll.* id est; idem ||

vol. cit. 7 (= p. 489, 8) id est || *v. l.* eadem ||

If such cases are seldom found, it is doubtless due not to their being confined to some local dialect but to the ambiguity of the abbreviations *id̄, īd, īdē,* etc., employed in the manuscripts. For these were used both for *idem* and for *id est.* While therefore a fourth century scribe may have used *idē* to represent an *idem* which he was copying,

a twelfth century scribe may have converted it into *id ē* and a modern editor into *id est.* Similarly an eighth century copyist may have abbreviated *idem* by id̄ and have been misunderstood by a later copyist. At any rate the Continuator Marcellini 547, 6 as cited by Mommsen *ad Jordanis Rom.* (published 1882) p. 51 reads *sed Artabanes utrosque comprehensos Gunthariun occidit, Iohannem idem Stotzam iuniorem vinctum transmittit ad principem,* but in Mommsen's edition of the Cont. Marc. (= Mon. Germ. Hist. Auct. Ant. vol. II, p. 108, 15) published in 1894 we read *Iohannem id est Stotzam.* See also Jordanes, Get. 22D *Attila deambulans circa muros . . . . animadvertit canidas aves, id est ciconias* || *v. l. idem* ||, and note the close parallelism between Cont. Marc. 547, 6 and C. I. L. vi, 22819 *inter primum et secundum in agro Pauliano idem Petroniano.* There are, of course, many cases in which the manuscripts vary between *idem* and *item;* see, e. g. Jordanes, Get. 119 *post Herulorum cede item Hermanaricus in Venethos arma commovit;* also 150 (*item ipse*) ; 159.

Idem appears in these sentences rather than *eiusdem, eodem,* etc., simply because in the great majority of cases the concept found in the two or more situations had previously occurred and was still occurring as the subject of the sentence, that is the prevailing grammatical form of this type of context was *Titus filius Vespasiani idemque Vespasianus* (Jordanes, Rom. 264), *post humatum patris Germani natus est filius idem* || vv. ll. *id est; item* || *Germanus* (Get. 314). The coincidence of *iidem, eidem, eisdem* and *iisdem* with *idem* in prounciation contributed to the prevalence of this form. For this reason, it seems to me, Mr. Sturtevant is quite justified in rejecting the view held by Ritschl and Lindsay that *idem* in sentences like Nos. 1, 4, 6 and 8 is a dative or genitive.

Attention seems never to have been called to the fact that *idemque* as well as *idem* appears in this usage, it being understood that in this case the *que* no longer has the force of a conjunction but has fused so completely with the concept expressed by *idem,* that no special force is to be assigned to it (cf. *quandoque* for *quando* in Long, Johns Hopkins Thesis 1899 and Archiv. Lat. Lex. vol. 11, pp. 395-404). Note the following cases:

[Fred.] Chron. 3, 11 (= p. 96, 13 Kr.) Dans idemque consilio;

op. cit. 4, 37 Etiam et Suggentensis et Turensis et Campanensis . . . . idemque amisisse visus est;

op. cit. 4, 68 etiam et Longobardi solucione Dagoberti idemque osteleter in Sclavos perrixerunt;

4, 90 (= p. 167, 6 Kr.) Erchynoaldus cum Neustrasius, quos secum habebat, idemque arma sumens, ad hoc bellum adgreditur; cf. 2, 53 (= p. 74, 15 Kr.) Acceptis idemque Agacius a Tursemodo Xmilia soledus . . . . Gothi . . . abigerunt;

4, 42 (= p. 142, 8 Kr.) in Auster Rado idemque hoc gradum honoris adsumpsit;

4, 76 (= p. 159, 11 Kr.) omnes Firmaverunt ut . . . . Burgundia soledato ordene ad regnum Chlodoviae post Dagoberti discessum aspecerit; Aoster vero idemque ordine soledato . . . . ad regnum sigyberti idemque in integretate deberit aspecere.

In many instances (possibly in one or two of those just cited) *idemque* may equal simple *idem* or *is.*

Similarly *itemque* is found with a force indistinguishable from simple *item;* cf. [Fredegar] Chron. 2, 57 (= p. 80, 3 Kr.) *et Tolomeus cum sociis itemque a Gothis vincti;* p. 2, 59 (= p. 83, 26 Kr.) *et Symmachum itemque;* also p. 80, 27 *qui itemque interfecti sunt.* Note also 2, 60 (= p. 84, 6) *Chrocus rex Wandalorum . . . . Renum . . . . transiens, primum ipsam*que *civitatem* (i. e. Mayence) *et populum vastavit; deinde cunctos*que *civitates Germaniae vallans, Mettis pervenit.*

As for the meaning of *idem* (and *idemque*) used "adverbially," it would seem that the too close association of the word with *item* on the part of grammarians has led to a somewhat biased interpretation. "*Zugleich*," "likewise," "also," etc., are the common renderings; yet an unbiased examination of the individual passages in which it occurs would show that *idem* (*idemque*) may often be more fittingly rendered by simple 'and' than by any of the above words, and many passages seem to demand this interpretation. Thus we see again how inappropriate is the term "adverbial" when used to describe this usage.

LIST OF BOOKS, PAPERS, ETC., ON THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.

[This list is prepared with special reference to Greek, Latin and Sanskrit. Only a few of the general handbooks (grammars, etc.) of these languages are mentioned. Many works dealing with the pronouns in other languages are mentioned in Brugmann, Die Demonstrativpronomina, pp. 18 f., 39 f., etc.]

d'Arbois de Jubainville, in Mem. Soc. Ling. de Paris, vol. 10. (On the *pronomen* infixum in anc. Greek and Irish.)

Ascoli, Intorno ai continuatori neo-latini de lat. *ipsu,* in Archivio Glott. Ital. vol. 15 (1901), pp. 303-313.

Bach, de usu pronominum demonstrativorum apud priscos scriptores latinos. Diss. Stuttgart, 1888.

Bach, de usu pronominum demonstrativorum apud priscos scriptores latinos (= Studemund's Studien auf d. Gebiete des archaischen Lateins, vol. 2, pp. 145-415). Berlin, 1891. (An elaboration of the preceding; a very full discussion of the meaning of *hic, ille, iste* and *is* in early Latin.)

Bergk, in Philologus, vol. 14 (1869), p. 185 (*quod* in *quod si, quod utinam,* etc. "ist auf den Ablativ zurückzuführen").

Bonnet, Le Latin de Grégoire de Tours, pp. 381-389. Paris, 1890.

Braun, Beiträge zur Lehre vom griech. Pronomen *οὗτος* u. *ὅδε* bei Aeschylus. Gymn. Progr. Marburg, 1879.

Braun, Der Gebrauch von *οὗτος* in d. Ilias. Festschr. für Collmann, Marburg, 1883.

Brugmann, see above, p. 1.

Caland, Zur Syntax der Pronomina im Avesta, in Verhdlgn d. Kon. Akad. van Wetensch. Afd Lett. vol. 20, pp. 1 ff.

Constans, De sermone Sallustiano, pp. 75-79. Paris, 1880. (Agreement of the demonstratives.)

Danielson, in Pauli's Altital. Stud. vol. 3, pp. 158 f.

Delbrück, Altindische Syntax (= Syntaktische Forschungen, vol. 5) pp. 209-221. Halle, 1888.

Dornseiffen, De articulo apud Graecos eiusque usu in praedicato. Amsterdam, 1856.

Düring, Über d. Pronomen bei Spencer. Diss. Halle, 1891.

Dyroff, Geschichte des Pronomen reflexivums, pts. I and II (= Schanz, Beiträge zur hist. Synt. d. griech. Sprache, vol. 3, pts 3 and 4). Würzburg, 1892, 1893.

Eggers, Über Eintheilung u. Bedeutung d. lat. Pronomens. Program, Altona, 1840.

Einenkel, Review of Spies, Studien, in Anglia, Beiblat, vol. 7 (1898), pp. 292-298.

Felix, Quaestt. Grammaticae in Vell. Paterculum, pp. 43 f. Diss. Halle, 1886.

Flensburg, Über Ursprung u. Bedeutung des Pronomen *αὐτός*. Lund, 1893.

Förstemann, Bemerkungen über d. Gebrauch d. Artikels bei Homer. Salzwedel, 1861.

Frank, *Heden,* in Tijdschr. v. Ned. Taal- en Lett. Deel 15, pp. 52 ff.

Fritsch, Über d. Sprachgebrauch d. Vell. Paterculus, pp. 17-20. Progr. Arnstadt, 1876.

Funk, Uber d. Gebrauch d. Pronomina *οὗτος* u. *ὅδε* bei Homer. Progr. Neubrandenburg, 1860.

Goelzer, Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de S. Jerome, pp. 404-409. Paris, 1884.

Gossrau, Lat. Sprachlehre.

Haegele, De pronomine *ipse* cum pronominibus personalibus uincto quaestio gramm. Progr. Culm, 1866.

Hand, Tursellinus, s. vv. *hac, huc,* etc.

Hausleitner, in Luthardts Zeitschr. f. kirchl. Wissenschaft, 1888, p. 98. (The article on Christian Latin.)

Havers, Das Pronomender *jener*-deixis in Griechischen, in Idg. Forsch. vol. 19 (1906), pp. 1 ff. (Cf. Berl. Phil. Woch. 1901, p. 88.)

Henze, Review of Funk's work on οὗτος and ὅδε and Förstemann on the article, in Philologus, vol. 27 (1868), pp. 494-518.

Hermann, Opuscula, vol. 1, pp. 333 ff.

Hoffmann-Krayer, Gothisches *jains,* ahd. *jener, enēr,* nhd. *ein* u. Verwandtes, in Kuhn's Zeitschr. vol. 34 (1897), pp. 144-152.

Hoppe, Über die Sprache des Philosophen Seneca pp. 8 f. Progr. Lauban, 1877.

Humboldt, Wm. v., Über d. Verwandschaft d. Ortsadverbien mit d. Pronomen in einigen Sprachen, in Abh. Berl. Akad. phil. hist. Kl. 1829, pp. i ff.

Kalb, Roms Juristen, pp. 6; 75; 99; 101; 142. Leipzig, 1890.

Kallenberg, Der Artikel bei Namen v. Ländern, Städten und Meeren in d. griech. Prosa, in Philologus, vol. 49, N. F. vol. 3 (1890), pp. 515-547.

Kallenberg, Studien über d. Griech. Artikel, pt. II. Berlin, 1891.

Kaulen, Handbuch zur Vulgata, pp. 144-146. Mainz, 1870.

Klussmann, Tulliana, pp. 6 ff. Progr. Gera, 1887.

Knoke, Über *hic* u. *nunc* in oratione obliqua (in Caesar). Progr. Bernburg, 1881.

Körting, Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch, s. vv. *hic, hoc, hora, idem, ille,* etc. Paderborn, 1891.

Koffmane, Geschichte des Kirchenlateins p. 137. Breslau, 1879.

Koch, De articulo Homerico. Leipzig, 1872.

Koziol, Der Stil des Apuleius, pp. 76-83. Vienna, 1872. (Häufung der Pronomina.)

Kühner-Gerth, Griech. Gramm. vol. II, 1 (1898), pp. 555-666.

Kvičala, Untersuchungen auf d. Gebiete d. Pronomina, besonders der latein. in Sitzungsberichte d. Wiener Akad. phil.-hist. Kl. vol. 65 (1870), pp. 74-155.

Kvičala, Badání v oboru skladby jazykův indoeuropských, část I. Prag, 1894.

Lamouche, Les determinatifs dans les langues slaves du sud, in Mem. Soc. Ling de Paris vol. 12, pp. 43 ff.

Lagergren, De vita et elocutione C. Plin. Secundi, pp. 179-183 (on *ob hoc, ad hoc,* etc.). Upsala, 1872.

Lönnergren, De syntaxi Sulpici Severi commentatio academica. Upsala, 1882.

Lupus, Der Sprachgebrauch des Cornelius Nepos, pp. 103-117. Berlin, 1876.

Mayer, B., in Blätter f. d. bayr. Gymn. u. Realsch. vol. 12 (1876) pp. 8-13. (On the *pronomen infixum* in Celtic and French.)

Meader, The Latin Pronouns *Is, Hic, Iste, Ipse.* New York, 1901.

Meillet, Recherches sur la syntax comparée de l' arménien. I. Les demonstratifs. Mem. Soc. Ling. de Paris, vol. 10, pp. 241 ff.

Meiring, Zur lat. Syntaxis, pt. II: Über das Pronomen relativum u. d. Pronomen überhaupt. Düren, 1853.

Meyer-Lübke, Grammaire de langues romanes (traduct.

française.) See tables génerales (vol. 4) *passim*. Paris, 1890-1906.

Miletic, On the Bulgarian Article. Zagreb, 1889.

Müller, Joh., Beiträge zur Krit. u. Erklär. d. Tacitus, pt. III. (*quod* in *quodsi*). Insbruck, 1873.

Netušil, Zur Etymologie u. Semasiologie von *iste* u. *ipse* nebst Zubehör, in Archiv. Lat. Lex. vol. 7 (1892), pp. 579-581.

Niemöller, De pronominibus *ipse* et *idem* apud Plautum et Terentium. Diss. Halle, 1887.

Noreen, Dalby målets ljud ock böjnungslära, pp. 205 ff. in Lundell's Nyare Bidrag t. Känn. om d. Sv. Landsmålen ock Sv. Folklif vol. 1.

Obermeier, Der Sprachgebrauch des M. Ann. Lucanus, pt. 1., pp. 14-16. Progr. München, 1886. (On *is, ipse, iste.*)

Oblak, Macedonischen Studien. Wien, 1896, pp. 96 ff.

Osann, De pronominis tertiae personae *is, ea, id* formis. 1845.

Pederson, Kuhn's Zeitschr. vol. 36 (1900), pp. 309-318, 336. (On Albanian *sa, si,* etc., and the Alb. article.)

Praun, Bemerkungen zur Syntax des Vitruv, p. 83. Progr. Bamberg, 1885.

Procksch, Über d. Gebrauch des Artikels, insbesondere beim Predikat, in Philologus, vol. 40 (1881), pp. 1-47.

Raschig, Brevis disputatio de pronominibus *hic* et *ille*. Progr. Schneeberg, 1832.

Reisig, Vorlesungen über lat. Sprachwissenschaft, vol. 3 (revised by Schmalz and Landgraf), pp. 84-103, 119-128. Berlin, 1888.

Reissinger, Über Bedeutung u. Verwendung d. Präpositionen *ob* and *propter* im älteren Latein, *passim*. Landau, 1897. (On *ob id, ob hoc,* etc.)

Ritschl, Fr. De *idem, isdem pronomine.* Progr. 1855 (= Opusc. vol. 2, p. 432).

Ritzenfeld, Der Gebrauch des Pronomens . . . . bei Kyd. Leipzig, 1889.

Rönsch, Collectanea Philologica, ed. Wagener, p. 219 (on *ipsiper*). Bremen, 1891 (= Berl. Philol. Wochenschr. 1884, Sp. 1500).

Rönsch, Itala u. Vulgata. 2d ed. pp. 275 f.; 419-425. Marburg, 1875.

Rönsch, Semasiologische Beiträge zum lat. Wörterbuch, 2es Heft, pp. 17; 19; 26 f. Leipzig, 1888.

Rozwadowski, Der demonstrativ-pronominal Stamm *ol-* in Idg. Forsch. vol. 3 (1894), pp. 264-276.

Rozwadowski, De *ol-* radicis pronominis demonstrativi vestigiis Celticis; quaestiones gramm. et etymol. pp. 1 ff. Krakow, 1897.

Schmidt, Max, Commentatio de pronomine graeco et latino. Halle, 1832.

Šorn, Der Sprachgebrauch des Eutrop, pt. II, pp. 3-5. Laibach, 1889.

Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax, pp. 201-209. Leyden, 1886.

Speyer, Vedische u. Sanskrit. Syntax, pp. 40 f. Strassburg, 1896 (= Bühler, Grundriss d. indo-arischen Philologie, vol. 1, part 6).

Spies, Studien zur Geschichte des engl. Pronomens im xv u. xvi. Jhdten (Inflection and Syntax) = Morsbach's Studien z. engl. Philologie. vol. 1, Halle, 1897.

Stummer, Uber d. Artikel bei Homer. Progr. Münnerstadt, 1886.

Sturtevant, Some unfamiliar Uses of *Idem* and *Isdem* in Latin Inscriptions, in Class. Philol. vol. 2 (1907), pp. 313-323.

Vondraček, Sprachvergleichendes zu dem bestimmten Artikel. Braunau, 1883.

Wackernagel, Über einige enclitische Nebenformen der

Personalpronomina, in Kuhn's Zeitschr. vol. 24 (1879), pp. 592-609.

Wagnon, Le pronom d' identité et la formule du réfléchie dans Homère, dans les poètes tragiques et chez les doriens. Geneva, 1880.

Wehofer (on *ipse* = *is* and *idem* in Novatianus), in Wiener Studien, vol. 23 (1902), p. 271.

Weissbrodt, De usu pronominibus *is* et *hic* quaestio. Progr. Brunsberg, 1878. (Discusses the forms only.)

Windisch. das *pronomen infixum* im Altirischen u. im Ṛgveda, in Idg. Forsch. vol. 4 (1895), pp. 420-426.

Windisch, Untersuchungen über d. Ursprung d. Relpronom. in d. idg. Sprachen, in Curtius' Studien, vol. 2, pp. 201 ff.

Wölfflin-Meader, see p. 1.

Wundt, Volkerpsychologie, Part 1, vol. 2, chap. 6, II; chap. 7, IV. 2d ed. Leipzig, 1904.

Zander, De relatione pronominali ea quae est per *quod* et *id quod*. Lund, 1885.

Ziegel, De *is* et *hic* pronominibus, quatenus confusa sunt apud antiquos. Marburg, 1897. (Treats chiefly the forms *ii, hi, eis, iis, his,* etc.)

See also Academy, Sept. 14, 1901; Athenaeum, Oct. 5, 1901; Educational Times, Oct. 5, 1904; Guardian, 1901; Nation, June 6, 1901; Oxford Magazine, Nov. 6, 1901; Pilot, Jan. 18, 1902; Speaker, Nov. 3, 1901.

A STUDY IN LATIN ABSTRACT SUBSTANTIVES

I undertook the following investigation with the purpose of discovering the reasons for the scarcity of nouns in *-tio* in the Augustan poets. I was soon led to undertake an examination of the relation between literary and popular vocabularies, that is, between classical and plebeian words, chiefly abstract substantives, and in particular certain classes of nouns including those in *-tio*. The present article gives the results of this latter half of the investigation. The results of my study of the use of abstract words by the poets will be published later.

I believe that there is no foundation for the prevalent belief [1] that abstract substantives in general are characteristic of the common speech, and that the classic language is extremely concrete. Those who hold such a view appear to have been too much influenced by the vocabulary of classical poetry, which is very concrete, and to have overlooked that of classical prose, or to have been led to an extreme view by their eagerness to establish the difference between classical and vulgar [2] Latin.

I shall attempt to prove (1) that, in respect to the use of substantives at least, classical prose is as abstract, or even more so, than the popular speech; (2) that no class of abstract substantives (in particular the class in *-tio*) can be said to be characteristic either of the popular speech or of the classical language as a whole; (3) that words which

[1] Cooper, Word Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius, p. 1.

[2] In this article "vulgar" is synonymous with "popular" used as a designation of the language of the masses.

were most common in the classical language were also most common in the popular speech, with few exceptions; that the greater part of all rare literary words either had no existence in the popular speech, or that their existence there was of short duration or of sporadic occurrence; and (4) that the appearance in post-classical literature of ante-classical words which did not become classical is not evidence, of itself, of the vulgar character of such words; but that the greater part, at any rate, of such revivals are due to the archaistic tendency of individual writers.

It is pertinent to our question to enter into some consideration of the so-called vulgar Latin. That there came, at some time, a complete break between the spoken language of the people of Rome and the written Latin, no one doubts. The existence of modern Italian proves this beyond all question. The only question is, when had the difference between the two become sufficiently marked to justify us in treating them as separate dialects. By the time of Dante, the two have become separate languages. The separation must have been gradual, at some periods doubtless slow, at others rapid. From Dante's time to the present, a period of six hundred years, the changes in spoken Italian have been comparatively few; from Plautus to St. Jerome, a period of six hundred years, we have no evidence that the changes in spoken Latin were great, comparatively speaking. However, radical changes in the vernacular did take place between 400 A. D. and 1000 A. D. The development of the Romance languages in countries representing the various provinces of the Roman Empire does not prove the existence of a vulgar Latin, differing from the literary language at the time of the breaking up of the Empire. We can show by phonetic laws that certain forms had an existence; but, if they do not occur in some record, who will

presume to say when they originated? May they not have arisen after the breaking up of the Empire? The instability of social, political, and linguistic conditions in Italy, for a period of seven hundred years, provided a basis on which the language of the Roman Empire might rapidly develop into the language of Dante.

Of course certain evidence in the various Romance languages points to a difference in the Latin as spoken in the different provinces. But, as we are impressed, not by the dialectical differences, but by the remarkable relative uniformity of the world-wide English speech, so the uniformity of Roman speech throughout the entire empire was doubtless the more impressive fact. The uniformity of the language of writers from Spain, Gaul, Africa, and Italy is sufficient warrant for such a belief. Differences there were, but the question is, were they sufficiently marked before the breaking up of the empire to differentiate the language into distinct dialects.

As the great bulk of the differences may have arisen since the breaking up of the empire, we might look for indications of the tendencies of a spoken Latin in points where all the Romance languages agree and at the same time are different from the written Latin. So far as I am aware, there is little evidence for tendencies which are not noticeable in the written language of the time of the empire. Some make themselves felt as early as the classical period, and others later, e. g., the tendency to the leveling of cases. We see this tendency in the Roman period and in the Romance languages, we find case distinction all but obliterated. A thoro consideration of this phase of the question is beyond my field of inquiry. My subject requires me to deal with only one phase of the question, word-formation, especially of abstract substantives.

I. SOME SUPPOSED EVIDENCES OF A DISTINCT VULGAR DIALECT

1. Some words occur in the early writers, disappear from the classical authors, and reappear in the later writers. It has been concluded,[1] from this fact alone, that such words in the meantime must have maintained themselves in the *sermo vulgaris*. May not these words have become archaic or obsolete in the spoken language, and have been borrowed by the later writers from early literature? Quintilian frequently condemns as ridiculous such revival of older peculiarities. He commends the use of antique words at times, for the sake of majesty, but he advises moderation and warns against affectation. Those that are too ancient, he says (1, 6, 43), should not be used at all, and then adds: *ergo, ut novorum optima erunt maxime vetera, ita veterum maxime nova.* The same tendency is satirized by Horace, Ep. 1, 1. Later, however, the tendency became more popular (cf. Gell. Noct. Att. 1, 10, 1).

Cooper (p. 44) says that: "The use of substantives in *-tudo* is one of the many archaisms which have maintained themselves in the vulgar Latin, and reappear in the literature of the decadence. A large proportion of the words of this class belong to the early period, the classical language forming in most cases corresponding substantives in *-tas*, while the plebeian Latin, true to its principles, clung to the more cumbersome forms in *-tudo*." Let us examine the evidence.

In Plautus we find 28 substantives in *-tudo;* of these, 13 appear in Cicero, and 11 of the 13 appear again either in modern Italian, Spanish, or French (*App. viii, 3*).[2] Of the

[1] Schulze, cited by Cooper, p. 44.

[2] References in parenthesis refer to the sections of the appendix at the close of this article.

15 which do not appear in Cicero, not one has found its way into one of the three modern languages, even though 8 are revived by later writers (*App. viii, 1-2*). Of the 15 (*App. viii, 4*), 6 are replaced in classical Latin by forms in *-tas*. The 6 forms in *-tas* all have modern descendants. The 6 forms in *-tudo*, of which 5 were revived by later writers, have no modern descendants. If these forms in *-tudo* maintained themselves in the popular speech from the time of Plautus till the time of Hieronymus, a period of six hundred years of strong literary influence, why during the next six or seven hundred years with little literary influence, did the popular speech put aside these forms to which it had clung so long, and adopt in each case the literary form in *-tas?* The late forms in *-tudo* are revivals due to certain individual writers who used them. Their place in the popular speech had long been lost. The forms in *-tas* belonged to the popular speech. For this very reason we find them both in the classical speech and in the modern languages.

Let us now extend the investigation to other classes of abstract substantives. In Plautus and Terence, I find 111 substantives in *-tus*. Of these, 86 appear in Cicero; and of the 86, 72 are found in Italian, Spanish, or French (*App. x, 3*). Of the 25 which do not appear in Cicero (*App. x, 1-2*), only three appear in the modern languages: *allegatus, concubinatus,* and *vomitus*. None of these words appear to owe their modern existence to popular influence. The first is a technical legal term; the second, in French at any rate, is a neologism borrowed from the Latin literature;[1] the third owes its modern existence to Celsus. So this class gives us practically the same results as the class in *-tudo*. Of 9 words in *-tus,* which are not classical, but were revived

[1] Cf. Hatzfeld and Darmesteter, Dictionnaire général de la Langue Française.

by later writers (*App. x, 1*), only the 3 above discussed are found in the modern languages. The non-classical words of the early writers, though revived by later writers, appear for the most part to have already become obsolete in the popular speech at the time of their revival by later writers.

The class of substantives in *-tio,* from the time of Cicero to the present day, has supplied a large part of our scientific vocabulary, and for this reason, at first sight, this class seems to give us somewhat different results. Of the Plautine Ciceronian words, 87% become modern (*App. ix, 3*). In this respect the class agrees with the two classes already discussed, but of 40 Plautine words (or words of Terence), which are not Ciceronian, 19 are found in the modern languages (*App. ix, 1-2*), and of 16 that are revived by later writers though not classical (*App. ix, 1*), 9 are found in the Italian, Spanish, or French. In the other classes, the Italian contains all the words that are found in either of the other languages and some number more. Of substantives in *-tio,* the French contains more than the other two. This is doubtless due to scientific influence, the French being more given to science and learning than the Italian and Spanish. Note the words *auscultation,* a medical term introduced in the nineteenth century;[1] *deambulation, congemination, expurgation,* scientific terms introduced in the sixteenth century; *integration,* a mathematical term introduced in the fourteenth century; *adition, pollicitation,* legal terms introduced in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. I need not give more. All or nearly all the non-classical words, whether they were revived by later writers or not, if they have a modern existence, appear to have been adopted directly from the ancient literature for

[1] For the time when words first appear in the literature, I have consulted first Hatzfeld and Darmesteter, and second Littré, Dictionnaire de la Langue Française.

scientific purposes. Their recent appearance in the modern literature is proof of this. Of the 9 non-classical words of Plautus and Terence, which are revived by late writers and appear in French, at least 6 are scientific terms, and the others are late introductions (*App. ix, 1*). Thus the evidence afforded by this class agrees with that of the two preceding classes.

I pass now to the examination of the whole Plautine vocabulary of substantives.[1] In round numbers, Plautus, according to Rassow, has a vocabulary of 2500 substantives. Of these, 1700 are Ciceronian, and of the 1700 about 1500 (over 85%) are found in Italian; but of the non-Ciceronian substantives only 31% have become Italian, and if we deduct the words which are classical, though not Ciceronian, we reduce the percentage to 20. A large number of this 20% are biological terms,[2] names of plants and animals. They are found mostly in Pliny, some in Cato, Varro and Columella. No one would venture to say that such are in character either exclusively popular or exclusively literary. Both the classical writers and the common people used them if they had occasion to do so. Many of them are names such as would seldom be used either by the common people or the literary man, but only by specialists like Columella and Pliny; and they reappear in the works of modern specialists. Of the non-biological terms, some are medical terms found in Celsus, some belong to legal terminology; a few, I believe, owe their modern existence to the influence of the Vulgate and of Christianity. The appearance of an ante-classical word in post-classical literature does not prove that such a word has maintained itself meantime in the popular speech. No one would deny that it might have re-

[1] The list given by Rassow, in Jahrbb. f. Class. Phil. Suppl. Band 12.

[2] Cf. Tommaseo, Dizionario della Lingua Italiana.

mained in use, but the evidence seems to show that this was the exception and not the rule, and that the greater part of the post-classical revivals are only literary.

2. The change in the vocabulary of literary Latin after the classical period was doubtless due in large part to foreign influence; but owing to the conservative character of the Romans, this foreign influence did not thoroughly transform the Roman life until after the time of Augustus. Only then does the Roman become a cosmopolitan. Earlier the Roman takes foreign material wherever he finds it, but in his hands it becomes Roman.

Cicero made one of the first attempts to adapt the Latin tongue to Greek philosophy; and from his time on, every phase of Greek culture found its way more and more into Rome. Lucretius, Celsus, Pliny, and later writers including the church fathers, endeavoring to express the new ideas, found the Latin language poor in technical terminology. It became necessary to do just what Cicero recommended: create new words, adopt the foreign words which came with the foreign civilization, or use old words with a new meaning. All of these means were employed, and the language was developed rapidly to meet the situation. The influence of the civilization of the Empire upon the language (both literary and popular as one organism) which it inherited from the Republic, is paramount, and the appreciation of it ought not to be lessened by an undue emphasis on the influence of vulgar Latin, which has been said[1] to be the chief factor in the "decadence" of the classical literature.

It makes no difference whether the linguistic innovations first made their appearance in the literature or in the popular speech. Many, we know, must have first appeared in

[1] Cooper, Intro. p. xviii, citing Stolz, Hist. Gram. vol. 1, p. 49.

the literature, or at least in the language of the educated, as the common people would not have occasion to use them.[1] Yet many new elements must have first found their way into the common speech, in which case a generation or two was sufficient to give them a place in the literature. In the matter of word-formation, however, which is my chief concern, I believe that the great majority of new derivatives are purely or chiefly literary. It is unreasonable to suppose that the vocabulary of the common people could supply terms for science and philosophy, or even theology, which were the phases of the new civilization that demanded the majority of the new terms.

A careful study of the new words and their meaning and application, combined with an examination of their modern descendants, would determine whether the great majority of new words which came in during the imperial period are due to literary influence, or whether "beginning with Livy an ever-broadening stream of popular words found their way upwards into the literature."[2] The present preliminary investigation affords some evidence that seems quite conclusive for two classes of substantives, one concrete (substantives in *-tor*) the other abstract (substantives in *-ntia*). The class in *-tor* especially should yield valuable evidence, because this suffix was productive in all periods.

Of Plautus' substantives in *-tor* which are not found in the classical writers, I find a larger per cent in Italian than of any other class. We have just seen that only 20% of all Plautus' non-classical substantives have corresponding words in the Italian. For the class in *-tor* I find 43%. I believe that this is largely due to the fact that *-tor* has been a productive suffix from the time of Plautus to the present

[1] Cf. Cooper's lists of new words that appear during the later period.

[2] Cooper, Intro. p. xxxv.

day.[1] It is more than probable that many of these words are re-formations in the late Roman period, or during the formative period of Italian, or even since the modern language has taken its more definite literary form. I choose this class, then, for discussion, because it, more than any other, favors the hypothesis that the popular speech was the source from which a large part of the later vocabulary was drawn.

In Cicero I find 279 substantives in *-tor*. Of these, 204 (about 75%) have corresponding forms in the Italian. Of 381 new words which appear in the literature from the time of Columella on,[2] 159 (about 40%) have corresponding forms in the Italian. The difference between 75% and 40% has significance, but let us observe further. Of Cicero's 75 substantives in *-tor*, which do not appear in Italian, 21 are apparently not found outside of Cicero, and at least 22 more are very rare and probably of Cicero's own coinage. While the literature of Cicero's predecessors is so scanty that we can not say how many words Cicero coined, it would seem likely that these 43 are of his own formation. If we grant this, at least 90% of the substantives in *-tor*, which Cicero found in the language, are still to be found in the Italian. The reasons for the origin and continued existence of the 40% of new (late) words are found in their meaning and application. Observe *annuntiator, baptizator, confessor, consecrator, contaminator, damnator, evangelizator, exhortator*,—all from Tertullian, who gives us 140 new substantives in *-tor*, of which 69 are found in Italian. An examination of Tertullian's list[3] will show that the great majority are directly due to the theological influence. So with the rest of the list of 381 new words, their very meaning often denies them a popular character, although it

[1] Cf. Meyer-Lübke, Ital. Gram., p. 264, § 485.
[2] Cooper, pp. 62 ff. [3] Cooper, p. 63.

would be absurd to deny that in general the popular speech was the means through which many words found their way into the literature, which in its turn influenced the vocabulary of the vernacular to some extent. But at Rome, as in every civilized community, specialized learning demands an extensive vocabulary which has no place in the language of the masses, especially of the proletariate. It is absurd to attempt, even in a small degree, to account for this specialized vocabulary by the influence of a popular dialect.

Olcott (p. 88) finds evidence of the vulgar character of substantives in *-tor* in the fact that (according to his statement) 47 words are known only to inscriptions. But I can find only 10 of these in Italian (or in Spanish or French, if the inscription was found in those provinces); and of these 10 words 5 occur in the literature after the Roman period. This can only mean that *-tor* was a very productive suffix, that the common people and writers alike used it to form new words when needed, but that the great majority of these new words, whether of popular or literary origin, did not maintain themselves in the language. If Olcott's list of 47 words are of popular origin, and they may well be, then of these popular words, about 20% have maintained themselves in the language, as against 40% of the new literary forms.

The class of abstract substantives in *-ntia* give us practically the same results. Cicero has 99, all but 9 of which appear in Italian, about 90% (*App. xi*). Of the 9 words, 6 are apparently found only in Cicero, and the other 3 are rare and probably coined by him. Of 99 new words that appear in the literature from the time of Columella on, only 48 (less than 50%) appear in Italian.[1] The only two non-literary forms that Olcott finds in inscriptions are absent from Italian.

[1] Cf. Cooper, p. 34; and *App. xii.*

In my entire investigation, the number of non-classical words that have become Italian has never risen above 50% for any class, author, or period, and on the whole they fall far below that; while for classical words the percentage seldom falls below 87 and never below 75. The greater part of these new words which are found in the modern languages, are rare literary words in Italian,[1] and do not appear in the popular speech.[2]

II. ABSTRACT SUBSTANTIVES AS CHARACTERISTIC OF THE POPULAR SPEECH

By abstract substantives I mean the names of immaterial things (actions, qualities, conditions). I adopt this definition because those who have dealt with the subject of abstract substantives in the vulgar Latin seem to have used the term "abstract" in this sense. However, if we should take abstract in the sense of that which is not limited to a definite point in time or space, our results would remain practically the same, with only this difference: the concreteness of Plautus and all the poets, and of such writers as Varro and Petronius would be more evident, while the abstractness of Cicero and Tacitus would be scarcely less apparent.

It has often been stated that the vulgar Latin was much more abstract than the classical speech.[3] This may be true, if one takes poetry as the standard for classical speech, and arbitrarily excludes the prose. Cicero says (Orator 67) that the language of the comedians is *sermo cotidianus* except for its *versiculi*. Horace, Sat. 1, 4, 45-48, agrees with

[1] Cf. Tommaseo, Dizionario della Lingua Italiana.

[2] Rigutini e Fanfani, Vocabulario Italiano della Lingua Parlata.

[3] Schmalz cited by Cooper, p. 1, and by Olcott, Studies in Word-formation, p. 1.

him, and looks upon the language of his own satires also in the same way. Let us then find the percentage of abstract expression in Plautus and the satires of Horace, and compare other writers with them.

For most of the writers I employ two methods and find the results to agree. I have counted the words in the vocabulary,[1] and then I have counted every actual occurrence of a substantive in the works of each writer and have distinguished between abstract and concrete use. According to the first method, in Plautus' vocabulary of substantives, 33⅓% are abstract; in Cicero's, 49; in Caesar's, 45; in Tacitus', 46; in Petronius', 32. According to the second method, Plautus' works show us 33.4%; Horace's satires, 31; and Petronius', 31. Cicero's philosophical works give us 62.3%; his orations, 52.4%; Caesar, 40; Tacitus, 50.2; Vitruvius, 35.2; Varro (De re rus.), 25.5; Horace (epistles), 40; Catullus (hexameters and elegiacs), 34; Virgil (Aeneid), 29; Juvenal, 27; Catullus (lyrics), 26; Horace (odes), 19. These numbers need no comment. Take any prose writer (or writer of comedy) that one may call vulgar and he falls far below any of the classical prose writers in abstract expressions. Even of the poets only a few fall below the so-called vulgar writer Petronius; and only in the Odes have I found Horace to fall below Varro in his *De re rustica.* These facts agree with a common sense view, for it is unreasonable to expect that the great mass of people would deal more in abstract expression than the literary man. The common people approach more nearly the simplicity of the child, who thinks almost wholly in the concrete.

Cicero says that his letters are *sermo plebeius,* but we have been told that we must not believe him. Nevertheless we must believe that he thought so; though in the matter of

[1] Some words which are used both as abstract and concrete cause some difficulty, but they are quite a negligible quantity.

abstract expression, his letters rise far above everything else which we can believe approached the common speech. But Cicero had become accustomed to think in the abstract. His letters are his conversational style, and differ from the common speech only as the thought of a Cicero would differ from the thoughts of the *volgus*. In 62 letters of Cicero, which I have examined, I find the percentage of abstract substantives to be 53.4. For his political letters it rises to 58%, while for the letters written to his brother and the members of his own family, it sinks to 50%. From all the above considerations, it is evident that Cooper's statement can not stand.[1] The classical writers used abstract expressions and abstract substantives more freely than did Plautus, or any one else who is traditionally called vulgar or inferior. Only among the poets do I find any classical writer who in abstract expression falls below Plautus.

III. Classes of Abstract Substantives Said to be Peculiar to Certain Trades

It is claimed[2] that certain classes of abstract substantives, notably those in *-tio* and *-tura*, are characteristic of rustic Latin and are thus identified with the *sermo vulgaris*. Olcott (p. 3) states to the contrary that they belong to all trades and professions. As the evidence shows, he is undoubtedly correct. It is argued that writers on agriculture use these classes of words without any apology for them, thereby implying that they belong to that pursuit of life. On the other hand, it is said that philosophers, medical writers, and theologians frequently offer apologies for the use of such words, by which they show that the words do not by right belong to their art. This situation is easily

[1] Cooper, p. 1, citing Schmalz, and cited by Olcott, p. 1.
[2] Cooper, p. 2.

understood. The two pursuits, statecraft and agriculture, were open to a Roman citizen from the earliest times. Are we to assume that the vocabulary of the Romans was insufficient to express their ideas on these subjects, except, of course, when speaking of foreign innovations? Why should Cato and Varro apologize for the use of long familiar words? On the other hand, the philosopher, the medical writer, and the theologian, dealing with arts till then almost unknown to the Romans, lacked a terminology suited to these subjects, and so were constrained to introduce Greek words, coin new words, or use old words with new meanings. Cicero usually preferred to coin new words and consequently felt that an apology was due. I have noted over 30 passages[1] where Cicero, in some way, indicates that he is using a new word; substantives in *-tio, -tudo, -tas, -ntia, -ia, -ium, -cula, -ola, -tus* are all represented. Substantives in *-tio* and *-tas* are most frequent. It should be observed that he nowhere apologizes for the class of words, or for the suffix, but for the new words; not for those which do not belong to the art for which he was writing, but for those which do not as yet belong to the language. Furthermore these apologies are confined to his philosophical and rhetorical works, and letters. None appear in his orations, in the De legibus or De re publica; in which fields the Roman was at home, and had an adequate vocabulary. Celsus deplores the poverty of the Latin tongue in medical terms. I have nowhere found him to apologize for substantives in *-tio*.

[1] Acad. post. 1, 4; 1, 5; 1, 24; 1, 25; De nat. 1, 43; 1, 44; 1, 48; 1, 95; 1, 109; Tusc. disp. 1, 35; 2, 64; 3, 83; 4, 25 (*bis*); 4, 26; 4, 27; 4, 28; 4, 64; Tim. 25; De inv. 1, 172; De div. 1, 95; 2, 58; Ad fam. 3, 7, 5; 5, 19, 2; De or. 2, 270; 3, 106; Part. or. 81; Orat. 53; De fin. 1, 21; 2, 11; 3, 28; 4, 41; Brutus 87; Ad Att. 1, 16, 13; 12, 1, 2; Top. 35; 31; De off. 1, 2; De sen. 45.

Caesar has as large a percentage of substantives in *-tio* as has Varro in his De re rustica, and larger than Cato. Sallust has nearly as many. Livy's percentage is also large. Nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ of the words of this class used by Varro are found in Caesar. Four-fifths of them are found in Cicero. All but 3 of Cato's appear in Cicero. Of the 64 substantives in *-tio* used by Varro (De re rustica), only 16 are agricultural terms, 30 more are technical, some legal, some official. Of Cato's 17, 11 are technical, of which only 3 are agricultural. Cicero has 31 substantives in *-tura;* Tacitus, 17; Varro, 16; Caesar, 13; Cato, 7: 6 of Varro's and 4 of Cato's are common to Cicero. This class of substantives is much more exclusively technical than the class in *-tio*. But while one half of Varro's words in *-tura* are agricultural terms, the greater part of Cicero's belong to the other arts. While every pursuit of the early Roman contained a few terms in this ending, legal, official, and agricultural terms predominate. There are also a number of military terms. This suggests an early origin for this class of words. While, then, the two classes of words are chiefly technical terms, they can not be said to belong as a class to any one trade or art, or to be characteristic of it.

IV CLASSES OF ABSTRACT SUBSTANTIVES AS CHARACTERISTIC OF THE POPULAR SPEECH OR THE LITERARY LANGUAGE.

1. *Class with suffix -or.* This suffix appears to have been almost, if not entirely, non-productive in the classical period. There is no evidence that it was productive in the time of Plautus. If there are new formations in the classical period or later, they appear to be the result of conscious individual effort. It is evident that the great mass of substantives in *-or,* being frequently used, long held their place in the language. About half the number that appear in the

literature of all periods are found in Cicero, Lucretius, or Tacitus.[1] Of 33 words found in Plautus,[2] all but 5 are found in Cicero, all but 4 in Tacitus. Of the 4, 2 are not in Cicero. Of the Ciceronian words only 2 fail to reappear in Tacitus. Of Lucretius' 49, 43 are found in Cicero or Tacitus. Tacitus shows in all 7 that do not appear in Cicero, and Cicero shows 9 that do not occur in Tacitus. Noticeable is the large number common to all writers.

Slaughter says that 49 occur in Lucretius (7400 verses) while only 35 occur in comedy (30,000 verses). Therefore, he says (on p. 21), this class of substantives belongs distinctively to a more elevated style of writing. But Cicero has 49 in a vocabulary of over 4000 substantives; Tacitus has 47 in a vocabulary of half that number. The so-called plebeian writer Petronius, in his small vocabulary, has 37, of which 35 occur in Cicero or Tacitus, and 25 in Lucretius. If we were to go by proportions, Petronius, Varro, and Plautus have a larger percentage than Terence, Cicero, Caesar, or Tacitus. Vitruvius has a larger percentage than Cicero or Caesar. The important fact is that a very large proportion of words of this class is common to all writers of all periods, regardless of style or content. Only the technical writers have a small number. The majority of words of this class are likewise found in Italian.[3] Here we find all but 2 of Cicero's 49; all but 2 of Petronius' 37; all but 3 of Tacitus' 47; all but 7 of Lucretius' 49. We conclude that the suffix *-or* was non-productive, that a few words of

[1] See Cooper, p. 25, for the total number in the language. See *App. xiv* for words in the various writers. Add the following for Lucretius: *amaror* (Virg.), *levor* (Plin.), *stringor*, *vagor* (Ennius).

[2] Cf. Rassow (excepting from his list *potior* and *maior*).

[3] For those which do not appear in Italian, see *App. xiii.*

the class may be archaic, but that the greater majority are good classical words, characteristic of no special period or style, belonging mostly both to the written and the spoken language, and still found in the modern spoken language. Their number is limited, but they are the names of qualities and passions common in daily experience, and, therefore, enter freely and frequently into all literature.

2. *Class with suffix -tudo.* It is interesting to compare with substantives in *-or* those in *-tudo.* Pauker, cited by Cooper, p. 44, gives the number in *-or* as 103 (85 *vett.,* 18 *recc.*), in *-tudo,* 137 (91 *vett.,* 46 *recc.*). It is to be observed that for the ante-classical and classical periods, the two classes are practically equal. The increase for *-tudo* is due to an increasing need for abstract expressions during the decline of Roman literature.[1] One of these classes (that in *-or*) has been declared to be characteristic of an elevated style, the other characteristic of vulgar Latin.[2] As a matter of fact remarkable correspondence is seen in the numbers of each class used by both ante-classical and classical writers, regardless of style or content. Of course, substantives in *-tudo* occur very infrequently in the poets, for metrical and other reasons. Their infrequent occurrence in poetry, however, is not sufficient to brand them as vulgar. Poetry must not be taken as the sole standard, nor must everything that can not be fitted into its limited mould, be declared plebeian. Of the 54 words mentioned above, 32 are Ciceronian. Of the latter, 12 are found in Plautus' 23; 8 in Terence's 9; 5 in Cato's 6; 12 in Varro's 17; 19 in Caesar's 19; 13 in Sallust's 14; 13 in Vitruvius' 17; 11 in Petronius' 11; 20 in Tacitus' 23 (*App. xiv*). Of Plautus'

[1] Cf. Schmalz in Müller's Handbuch II, 2, p. 430, § 32; Cooper, p. 37; Goelzer, La Latinité de Saint Jérome, p. 79.

[2] Cooper, pp. 25 and 44.

23, 11 are not found in Cicero;[1] of Terence's 9, 1; but the striking fact, as with substantives in *-or,* is that the greater part of them is common to all these writers both classical and "plebeian." Of Plautus' words of this class that are not also classical, not one becomes modern (*App. viii*), while of those that become classical, only one fails to become modern (*App. viii, 3*). Of 20 non-Plautine words that Cicero uses, all but 6 become Italian words (*App. xiv*), and these 6 words are rare, only one of them occurring in any other of the writers consulted. Of the 11 which the other writers consulted add to Cicero's list, only 2 are found in Italian. To summarize, the suffix *-tudo* was productive only so far as it was sporadically revived by individuals in need of abstract expressions. A considerable number of Plautus' words became obsolete, some being replaced by words in *-tas.* Some of these obsolete words were revived by later writers, but failed to gain a permanent place in the language. A few words were coined by the later writers, but gained little acceptance. The majority of the words were good classical words, were good plebeian words, are good Italian words, characteristic of no period or special style. However, we should add that by their nature they were excluded from poetry.

3. *Class with the suffix -tas.* Substantives in *-tas,* as in the case of every other productive suffix in Latin, have been assigned by some one[2] to the vulgar speech. Cooper, however, declares that they are characteristic of an elevated style, basing his conclusion on the single fact that "there is no class of which a larger proportion of the older words are in good usage," in the classical period. The percentages of words used by Plautus, which are found in Cicero, are as

[1] Cooper gets 13 by adding *canitudo* (fr. Ap. Fest.) and *macritudo* (an uncertain reading) to Rassow's list.

[2] Schulze, cited by Cooper, p. 38.

follows (*App. viii-x, xiv*) : *-tio,* 60%; *-tus,* 65%; *-tura,* 55%; *-tas,* 80%; *-tudo,* 52%; *-ntia,* 70%; *-ium,* 77%; *-monia* and *-monium,* 75%; *-itia,* 90%; *-or,* 82%. Cooper's statement is true, if we except the classes in *-itia* and *-or.* Mere numbers and ratios, however, are often misleading. We should add, therefore, that words in *-tio* and *-tus* are the only classes of abstract substantives of which a larger number of the old words fail to appear in the classical period than of the class in *-tas.* The reason for this is evident. Both *-tio* and *-tus* were used to form words from the same verbal stem, with very little or no difference in meaning. In Plautus' time they were very evenly balanced, 94 of the one, 99 of the other.[1] In Cicero's time both were productive suffixes, but *-tio* had gained the ascendency. Cicero has 818 in *-tio* and 238 in *-tus.* It is easy to see how, when there are two words of similar meaning from the same stem, one of them becomes obsolete as the other gains the ascendency. On the contrary the only rival of the suffix *-tas* was *-tudo,* which was no longer a productive suffix, except as it was now and then employed by a later writer. This is evident. Plautus has 23 forms in *-tudo.*[1] Cicero with twice the vocabulary has only 32 (*App. xiv*). This includes nearly all words of this class used by any classical author. The "vulgar" Petronius adds but one. Of words in *-tas,* while Plautus has only 72,[1] Cicero has 246 (*App. xv*). The conclusion is inevitable. There existed in the language a limited number of substantives in *-tudo.* Few or no new words were added. The suffix *-tas* was very productive.[2] Many of the new forms had meanings identical with old forms in *-tudo.* While few or no new words in *-tudo* arose to displace forms in *-tas,* many new forms in *-tas* were actually dis-

[1] See Rassow.

[2] Olcott (p. 99) finds no evidence for the prevalence of words in *-tudo* in the popular speech, i. e. in inscriptions.

placing words in *-tudo*. More of Plautus' words in *-tas* than in *-tudo* fail to appear in the classical literature (*App. viii*), but the small total of words in *-tudo* raises its proportion of obsolete words. Although Cooper's statement is true, his explanation is certainly erroneous. There are fewer words in *-tudo*, but as far as they go they are as good classical words as those in *-tas*, remembering that some words in both suffixes coined by individuals for their own purpose never found a place in the language at large, either literary or popular. My contention that *-tudo* was unproductive, excepting sporadic individual effort, is supported by the fact that Olcott (p. 68) finds no new forms in inscriptions. Some of the obsolete forms in *-tudo* were revived in later times, when only forms in *-tas* existed in the classical language. This proves nothing except the well-known fact that in later times the Latin vocabulary expanded in meeting the demands for abstract expressions. On the contrary very few or none of such revived forms find their way into the Romance languages (*App. viii*). Not one of 5 archaic words in *-tudo*, revived by later writers after having been displaced in classical Latin by forms in *-tas*, is found in Italian, while all of the forms in *-tas* which displaced them are found in Italian (*App. viii, 4*). All but one of Plautus' words that became Ciceronian are found in Italian or Spanish (*App. viii, 3*). "In some cases, however, the phenomenon is reversed," says Cooper (p. 38). "There are certain forms in *-tas* confined to ante-classical and post-classical times, which are replaced in the classical Latin by words in *-tudo*." He says, therefore, that these unusual words in *-tas* are to be assigned to the *sermo cotidianus*,[1] which, standing near to the classic speech, tended to extend by analogy the scope of the dominant suffix *-tas*."

[1] By *sermo cotidianus* Cooper means a compromise between the literary and popular dialects.

Such a conclusion can not stand in the face of the following facts. Of the three examples of this phenomenon given by Cooper, 2 forms in *-tudo* are found in both Terence and Plautus, 2 occur in Italian and the third in Spanish;[1] but of the forms in *-tas,* not one occurs in Plautus or Terence, and not one is found in Italian. These forms in *-tudo* do displace those in *-tas* in the classical Latin, but why? Cicero used the forms in *-tudo* because they were common in the language, not in the spoken language only, nor in the written, but common to the whole organism. For the same reason, Plautus and Terence used them; for the same reason they have persisted in the modern speech. Cicero did not use the forms in *-tas,* because they were common neither in the spoken nor the written language. They were peculiar to a few individuals who coined them in early times, or who revived them in later times. Cooper implies that the opposite case is of frequent occurrence; but we find only 5 forms in *-tudo* which are only ante- or post-classical with corresponding classical forms in *-tas.* But observe that, as stated above, the classical forms in *-tudo,* which Cooper says displaced during the classical period certain ante- and post-classical forms in *-tas,* occur in Plautus and Terence, but none of the corresponding forms in *-tas;* while for the 5 classical forms in *-tas,* which displaced the ante- and post-classical forms in *-tudo,* only 2 occur in Plautus and 4 of the displaced forms of *-tudo* occur in Plautus. This only confirms my contention that, after the time of Plautus, *-tas* was a productive suffix and *-tudo* was not.

4. *Class with suffix -ntia.* This suffix (equals *-nt* + *-ia*) was seldom or never used in Plautus' time to form verbal abstracts; although later on it is used to form verbal abstracts. In the time of Plautus, all substantives with this suffix seem to be nouns of quality formed from adjectives

[1] *Dolcitudine, solitudine,* Spanish *polcritud.*

or participles, e. g. *audientiam* (Poenulus 11). It never expresses the motion or action of a material object, at least in the time of Cicero, but mental action, or a quality, condition, or state, e. g. corresponding to *venio* there is no word "*venientia*," but only *ventio*, while to *convenio* correspond both *convenientia* and *conventio*. It should be remembered, then, that the suffix *-ntia* never became a general verbal suffix like *-tio* and *-tus*. Substantives of this class never entirely gave up their force as adjectival abstracts. For this reason I class *-ntia* with *-tudo* and *-tas* rather than with *-tio* and *-tus*. Originally, it plainly belonged within the class with *-ia*, but, unlike *-ia*, it continued to be productive. Plautus has 100 substantives in *-ia*, 26 in *-ntia* (cf. Rassow). In Cicero the class in *-ia* shows no increase in numbers (99),[1] while the class in *-ntia* shows a marked increase (100; cf. *App. xi*).

The class of substantives in *-ntia* is declared by Cooper (p. 32) to be a favorite of the *sermo plebeius*. He cites Lorenz for the fact that a large number of the Plautine words of this class are dropped from the classical speech, and revived by the archaistic writers. He further states that their "chief activity" belongs to post-classical times. As a matter of fact there was a considerable body of words of this class in both the classic and the popular language. However, the numerous new words introduced, whether coined or revived, had no large place in the language outside of the works of a few writers who used them. In fact, Plautus has 26;[2] Terence, 21; Varro, D. r. r., 8; Cato, 2; Caesar, 27; Cicero, 100; Vitruvius, 40; Petronius, 25; Tacitus, 68. Cicero has 18 out of Plautus' 26; 22 out of Caesar's 25; 23 out of Vitruvius' 40; 27 out of Sallust's 31;

[1] About 10 of Plautus' words in *-ia* do not appear in Cicero.

[2] For Plautus, see Rassow; for Terence, Slaughter, Substantives of Terence; for the rest, *App. xi.*

54 out of Tacitus' 68; all of Cato's, Varro's, Terence's and Petronius'. Notice that the great majority are common to all, that Cicero's vocabulary contains all the words of the class used by the so-called vulgar writers, Cato, Varro, and Petronius, also all of Terence's, and a very large proportion of Caesar's, Sallust's and Tacitus'. I conclude, then, that words which are common to a large number of authors, are words in good usage both in the written and spoken language indiscriminately, and that words (whether coined or revived) peculiar to one or a few writers found no permanent place in the language. If these rare literary words had been of common occurrence in a popular dialect, and borrowed from it, as has been assumed by some scholars, they should have many modern descendants. All but 8 of Cicero's 100 words occur in Italian, 6 of the 8 being found only in Cicero, and the other two rarely elsewhere. Vitruvius has 40 words of this class, of the 23 found also in Cicero not one fails to appear in Italian, while of the remaining 17, 9 fail to appear in Italian. Tacitus has 68; of the 54 found also in Cicero not one fails to appear in Italian; of the 14, 5 fail to appear in Italian; of Caesar's 28, 26 appear in Cicero and reappear in Italian, of the other two, one fails to appear in Italian; of Sallust's 31, 27 are found in Cicero, and also in Italian, of the other 4, 2 do not appear in Italian; Terence's 21 words all appear in Cicero, and all appear in Italian. All of the words of the so-called vulgar writers, Cato, Varro, and Petronius appear in Cicero and reappear in Italian.

Cooper gives a list of 10 words[1] from Plautus which "seem to have been avoided by classical writers." All of them but one are revived by later writers, but only 2 have

[1] This number includes 6 of the 8 not found in Cicero. To it he adds one which occurs in Cicero but once, and 3 from fragments not cited by Rassow.

found their way into Italian. Is it likely that these words had an existence for 400 years in the popular speech without finding their way into the literature, and then having appeared in a few works disappeared from the whole language, while all of Plautus' words that become classical also become Italian? On the basis of this class of words Terence appears more classical than Plautus; but he is also more vulgar, for, all of his words are still popular. Manifestly he took pains to follow what was both the popular usage and that of the *literati*. Plautus, however, as it would seem, often used Greek words, or coined new ones, or used rare ones, rather than take pains, as did Terence, to express his ideas in the words already in common use among the people. The rare words which Plautus used, or new ones which he had coined, found no permanent place in the language, although their revival by some later author may have tended to preserve them.

Let us examine the evidence supplied by the usage of other authors than Plautus. Cooper gives a list of 38 new words in *-ntia* from Tertullian. Of these, 19 appear in Italian; of 11 from Augustine, 4 appear in Italian. Those that do appear in Italian are mostly due to the influence of the church and the ecclesiastical literature and not more than half of them have ever reached the spoken language.[1] Cooper considers it very significant, that out of a dozen words of this class found first in Vitruvius, *crescentia*[2] and *resonantia* peculiar to him occur in Italian; but this is the exception, not the rule. The other 6 peculiar to him do not occur in Italian, nor do any of the 8 peculiar to Cicero. The significant fact is that the great majority of all words

[1] Test Cooper's list by Rigutini e Fanfani, Diz. Ital. della Lingua Parlata.

[2] *Crescentia* is not peculiar to Vitruvius, but *deconcrescentia* is.

peculiar to any author or to a few authors fail to appear in Italian.

Schulz, followed by Cooper and Olcott (p. 73), observing that there are many new words of the class in *-ntia,* in the late writers, especially, Apuleius, Gellius, and Tertullian, concludes that the suffix seems to have been prevalent in the *sermo vulgaris,* particularly as it has left numerous progeny in the Romance languages. Olcott states that the substantives of this class found in inscriptions are for the most part of frequent and classical occurrence,[1] and I find the same to be true of the modern progeny. It appears then that the assumption of Schulze is erroneous. Substantives in *-ntia,* as far as we have any evidence, were no more numerous in the popular speech than in the classical language. Of course some of these words of the late writers may have had their origin in the popular speech. They are the ones which for the most part are found in spoken Italian. On the other hand, some words of literary origin have certainly found their way into literary Italian.[2]

5. *Class with suffix -tio.* I group *-tio, -tus,* and *-tura* together as verbal suffixes. Substantives in *-tura* are restricted and technical in their application, and therefore I shall treat them by themselves; and shall discuss *-tus* in more immediate connection with *-tio.*

Cooper (p. 3) says of the substantives in *-tio,* "Their number in classical Latin far exceeds that of any other class of abstract nouns, as the needs of a philosophic vocabulary was chiefly supplied by this suffix. . . . . Cicero, however, was the first and last classic writer to make an extended use of them. . . . . Many are found only in his philosophical works, many others, borrowed from the *sermo*

[1] He finds two non-literary forms, but neither occurs in Italian.

[2] Tommaseo, and Rigutini e Fanfani.

cotidianus, are confined to his letters, early writings or Philippics; but the strongest proof of their unpopularity is the large number of them, which not even the authority of Cicero could bring into general usage." Cicero's extensive coinage only proves that *-tio* was a very productive suffix in his time. Its failure to pass into general usage only emphasizes the fact that no one individual can materially change a language. The wonder is that so much of his coinage was accepted, and its acceptance is due not to Cicero, but to its popularity. It is true that Cicero used them more extensively than any other classic writer, his vocabulary was more extensive, but it is not true that they were unpopular with other writers. Caesar has a larger number of them than of any other class of abstract substantives, 109 in *-tio,* 49 in *-tus* (*App. xx, xxviii*). Sallust shows a preference for them and Livy's percentage is large. Tacitus has 240 in *-tio* to 183 in *-tus.* In classical prose their percentage is higher than in Plautus and Terence. They are frequent, however, in the comic writers, whose language, says Cicero, is *sermo cotidianus* except for its *versiculi.* For good reasons they very seldom occur in classical poetry.

All or nearly all verbal substantives in Latin were formed by the suffixes *-tio* and *-tus.* In Plautus and Terence the two classes seem as yet undifferentiated. Both are *nomina actionis.* Neither author shows preference for either class. Plautus has 94 in *-tio,* 99 in *-tus* (cf. Rassow and *App. vi*); Terence 36 in each (cf. Slaughter). Where the literature contains both forms, Terence has chosen equally between them (*App. xvi, xvii*), but in more than two-thirds of the cases, the form which Terence did not choose is post-Augustan, rare, or (in a few cases) has been differentiated. Evidently Terence chose the word that was in most common use. By the first century B. C. in most cases, the two classes

of words had become differentiated. Most of the substantives in *-tio* are strictly verbals,[1] while many in *-tus* have become concrete. The class with the suffix *-tus* have generally become farther removed from the verb, representing mostly the result of the action rather than the action itself (e. g. *adventus*). Substantives in *-tio* are frequently technical in their application,[2] those in *-tus* always general. Out of 109 substantives in *-tio* used by Caesar, 93 have a technical meaning, 31 are military terms, and about the same number official or legal (*App. xx*). Cooper (p. 4) states that the prevalence of these words in rustic Latin (for example in the Scripp. r. r.), identifies them with the *sermo plebeius*. But Cicero, Caesar, Vitruvius, and Tacitus have not only a larger number of these words in *-tio* than Varro, but also a larger percentage of their abstract nouns and a larger percentage of all their substantives are words in *-tio*. Cato's percentage is still less than Varro's. Of Varro's substantives, 5.3% are in *-tio;* of Cicero's, 20%; of Vitruvius', 14%; of Tacitus', 11%; of Caesar's, 10%. Nearly one-third of Varro's substantives in *-tio* are found in Caesar. Out of 64, only 11 fail to appear in either Caesar or Cicero (*App. xx*). Only 16 are agricultural terms, while 30 more are technical terms, some military, some legal, and some official. Cato has 17 substantives in *-tio,* of which 11 are technical terms, only 3 belonging especially to agricultural terminology.[3]

In Cicero's De sen. 54, occur 10 words in *-tio*. Apropos of this fact Cooper (p. 4) observes that most of these words

[1] Vitruvius uses several in a concrete sense.

[2] Schmalz in Müller, Handbuch, II, 2, p. 430, states that those which represent the result of an action belong to the business and official language.

[3] Observe that about ¼ of Cato's and ¼ of Varro's substantives in *-tio* are agricultural terms, so about ¼ of Caesar's are military.

in *-tio* are not found elsewhere in Cicero, but are found in Cato, Varro, and Pliny; and then adds: "These ten words, so thoroughly in keeping with the character of the speaker (Cato), but elsewhere avoided by Cicero are full of significance, and certainly sustain the view that these substantives in *-tio* are prevalent in the *sermo rusticus.*" Unquestionably true; but substantives of this class are equally prevalent everywhere in the Latin language except in poetry. In Cicero's letters the number of substantives in *-tio* is not large; there are only 33 peculiar to them (*App. xviii*), while Cicero's total number is 818 (*App. xx*). Of the 33, only 10 are peculiar to Cicero; and of the 10, only 4 appear in Italian; and of these, 3 appear also in the French, being late scientific terms.[1] Many of the remaining 23 certainly were vulgar words as well as classical, for 19 of them are found in the Italian. The 4 that do not appear in Italian, though found in other writers, are of very rare occurrence. We must believe that Cicero was guilty of neologisms even in his letters.[2] Had these words, peculiar to him or rare, been taken from the popular speech, they would probably have left a larger progeny in the modern vernaculars. Of the words peculiar to Cicero's letters, only three-elevenths appear in Italian; of Terence's words of this class, three-fourths appear; of Petronius', six-sevenths. Of Petronius' 97 words, only 17 fail to appear in Cicero; of the 17, 10 fail to appear in Italian; of the 80 which do appear in Cicero, only 4 fail to appear in Italian. Here, as in the case of substantives in *-ntia,* we observe that words which are more classical are also more vulgar, that Terence is more classical than Plautus and also more vulgar: 81% of Terence's substantives in *-tio* became classical; 63% of

[1] Cf. Hatzfeld and Darmesteter.

[2] Ad fam. 3, 7, 5; 5, 14, 2; Ad Att. 1, 16, 13; 12, 1, 2.

Plautus';[1] 75% of Terence's appear in Italian; 63% of Plautus'. Of a list of 23 words of Plautus given by Cooper, as non-classical, and therefore vulgar, only 5 have found their way into Italian; of the remaining 71, 54 are found in Italian.

6. *Class with suffix -tus.* The suffix *-tus* is a most interesting one. Some declare it vulgar and others say that it is characteristic of an elevated style. Cooper (pp. 3, 18) thinks it significant that out of 94 words in *-tio* used by Plautus, the classic writers "avoided" 25, while of 99 in *-tus,* all but 21 became classical. A difference of 5% is rather small on which to base sweeping conclusions, but let us examine the facts. Of Plautus' substantives in *-tio,* 63% have progeny in the Italian; 70% of those in *-tus* have like progeny, but only 7[2] of the 25 non-classical words in *-tio* are found in Italian, and only 3 of the non-classical 21 in *-tus.* Evidently a larger proportion of the words in *-tus* than in *-tio* is classical; but on the other hand a larger percentage is also vulgar. Here as before the more classical words are also the more vulgar. Cooper (p. 19) states that this suffix is absent from the Romance languages, excepting the Roumanian, and finds herein evidence of its classical character. As a matter of fact the suffix *-tus* in the form *-to* does appear in Italian and Spanish (see Olcott, p. 5). We have already observed that 70% of Plautus' words in *-tus* have progeny in the Italian.

Cooper (p. 18) rightly notes as important that technical writers such as Cato, Varro, Columella, and Vitruvius add very few forms in *-tus* while they add large numbers in *-tio.* Technical writers like Cicero, Vitruvius, and Celsus have

[1] Cf. Rassow, Slaughter, and *App. ix.*

[2] At least 4 of the 7 are scientific terms of late adoption and not popular at all. Cf. *App. ix,* also Tommaseo, Hatzfeld and Darmesteter, and Littré.

three times as many substantives in *-tio* as in *-tus* (*App. xx, xxviii*); Caesar, who is less technical, has twice as many. Tacitus, whose works are more general, has about one-third more in *-tio*. Non-technical writers such as Plautus, Terence, and Petronius have about an equal number in each class. Caesar's and Tacitus' technical vocabularies (legal and official terms and military terms of a more general character) nearly coincide with Cicero's (*App. xxi, xxii*), so that they add very little. Caesar, however, being a general and having more intimate personal relations with the camp life than Cicero the orator, gives us over and above Cicero terms referring to the minor details of camp life and warfare. So also Tacitus, as a historian. Varro and Vitruvius, of course, give us quite a different technical terminology (*App. xxiii, xxvi*). Of 10 substantives in *-tio* used by Varro, which are not found in Cicero, 8 are agricultural terms. Of the 106 used by Vitruvius, which are not found in Cicero, 73 are technical architectural or astronomical terms, the majority of them never used in any other sense. Cicero's vocabulary is too numerous to reduce to numbers, but a mere reading of the list (*App. xx*) will reveal the predominance of philosophical, legal, and official terms.

Technical writers and in fact all prose writers introduce more words in *-tio* than in *-tus*, so that the total number of substantives in *-tio* (3124) is over three times as many as the total in *-tus* (1004). This means that a larger percentage of substantives in *-tus*, being of a general character, are common to all writers, regardless of subject matter, while every subject demands its own words in *-tio*. Tacitus, whose subject was of a general character and whose technical vocabulary, so far as he had one, coincides with Cicero's with a few exceptions, adds a few more words in *-tus* than in *-tio;* i. e. the words that he adds to Cicero's vocabulary are mostly of a general character, therefore more occur in

-tus which are more general in their application (*App. xxix*). Even many of his words in *-tio* not found in Cicero are of general application (*App. xxi*); while for Caesar nearly all are technical (*App. xxii*). Also Caesar adds fewer words in *-tus* than in *-tio*. Varro and Vitruvius, whose subjects were technical and demanded a vocabulary differing from Cicero's technical vocabulary, add a great many more in *-tio* than in *-tus*, and such words are nearly all technical terms (*App. xxiii, xxvi*).

For Plautus and Terence, substantives in *-tus* give the same result as the classes in *-tio* and *-ntia*. Of Plautus' substantives in *-tus*, 79% become classical; of Terence's, 84%; of Plautus', 70% are found in Italian; of Terence's, 80%. We should observe that the percentage of Terence's words in *-tus* which have become Italian is not quite so much greater than Plautus', as in the case of words in *-tio* (75% and 63% respectively). While Plautus more frequently introduced neologisms than Terence, he more often used *-tio*, as did all writers for the coinage of new words. Therefore more of the class in *-tio* fail to become classical and for the same reason do not appear in Italian. These proportions together with those for *-tio* (see the preceding section) seem to indicate that Terence kept closer to the language of the people than did Plautus.[1]

From the evidence it appears that the number of words of the two classes which were in common use in the popular speech and in the literature, was about equal. Petronius has 98 in *-tio* and 77 in *-tus*. Plautus has 94 in *-tio* and 99 in *-tus*, Terence has 36 in each class.

7. *Class with suffix -tura.* Vitruvius has 43 words of this class; Cicero with twice the vocabulary has only 31; Caesar has 16, Plautus 18, Tacitus 17, Varro 16, Petronius

[1] These percentages are computed from Rassow's and Slaughter's lists and the lists in *App. ix, x, xx, xxviii.*

16. Vitruvius is the only one of whom the statement holds that substantives in *-tura* are more numerous in the less classical than in the more classical writers (cf. Olcott, p. 51). But inferior Latinity does not necessarily coincide with vulgar Latin.

As Vitruvius was a specialist, we should expect to find large numbers of substantives in *-tio* and *-tura* in his works, since these two suffixes were always very productive for technical and special vocabularies; but their "vulgar" character is not thereby established. Of 43 substantives in *-tura* used by Vitruvius, 20 are given by Cooper (p. 29) as new words. Of the 20, there are found in Italian only 9, of which, 5 are frequently used by later writers; while of the remaining 23 words, all but 5 are found in Italian. Here again it is manifest that the more classical is likewise the more vulgar. Only 4 of the words peculiar to Vitruvius occur in Italian. They are all architectural terms: *contractura, foliatura, membratura, proiectura.*

On 12 verbal stems, Vitruvius has words with each of the suffixes, *-tio, -tura,* but the pairs of words are not identical in meaning. In 7 of the 12 pairs, one or the other is concrete; the other 5 are differentiated. All of these forms in *-tura* except 3 are in Cooper's list of new words. Only 4 of them have found their way into Italian, and 2 of these were not new with Vitruvius. Nor is it a case of the survival of the fittest, for in two out of the four cases, the forms in *-tio* have also become Italian. This is not surprising, for most of these words in *-tio* are not peculiar to Vitruvius. Some of them are quite common in the literature, but not in the sense in which Vitruvius used them. Few of them in Italian have the meaning which he gave them (*App. xxxvi*). With good reason 8 of the words in *-tura* fail to occur in Italian, being doubtless Vitruvius' coinage and very rare. Of the 4 which have become Italian,

3 are common words in the language. The other one is confined to technical language (architectural) both ancient and modern, and appears in French in the 17th century. Of the remaining 31 words, 16 have cognate forms in *-tio* in the literature, and 12 of these 16 words in *-tura* are concrete (*App. xxxvii*). It has often been observed (cf. Cooper, p. 28) that many substantives in *-tura* became concrete in the late language, but for this period Vitruvius stands quite by himself. His need for more than one term from the same stem, one concrete and another abstract, explains the presence of so many words of this class in his writings.

Before leaving Vitruvius, we should observe that all but 6 or 7 of his 43 substantives in *-tura* are technical terms; 18 are architectural. A comparatively large number of substantives in *-tura,* mostly technical, occur in Cato, Varro, and the other Scripp. r. r. as observed by Stuenkel,[1] who for this reason assigns them as a class to the *sermo rusticus.* However, their frequent occurrence in these writers does not indicate that they are characteristic of the *sermo rusticus.* They are equally plentiful in the technical vocabulary of every trade and profession. Varro's percentage is a little larger than that of Caesar, Tacitus, or Cicero, but with a smaller general vocabulary, he covered his subject and used nearly all of the terms peculiar to it. Others with a large general vocabulary could do no more. It is significant that all the words in *-tura* used by Cato have become Italian, and that 50% of Varro's new words (i. e. new to the literature) have also become modern, while only 40% of Vitruvius' new words are found in Italian.

In a list of 57 substantives in *-tura* given by Cooper (p. 29) as new words after the Augustan period, only 21 appear in Italian. Of 16 introduced by Gellius, Apuleius, and

[1] Cited by Cooper, page 27.

Tertullian, only 4 appear in Italian. Of Pliny's 15 new words, 8 are found in Italian, but 5 of them are used frequently enough by later writers to fix them in the language. Thus Pliny, who has been called (Cooper, p. 28) a fertile source for rustic vocabulary, appears to have used words which were not so much rustic or vulgar as rare or newly coined. The facts show that the new words and rare ones in his works, as in the works of others, are not so much evidence of a vulgar dialect as of newly coined words peculiar to the writer, or to him and a few of his followers.

Olcott (p. 52) finds evidence of the vulgar character of this suffix in the fact that in inscriptions there occur 9 non-literary forms in *-tura*, all ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. Of the 9 which he calls ἅπαξ λεγόμενα I find three in Mediaeval Latin (see DuCange), and of the 3 two occur in Italian. None of the remaining 6 are found in Italian. Olcott gives a list of 47 words of this class found in inscriptions. Of these, 24 have offspring in Italian, of which only 2 fail to appear in the literature before the fall of the Empire, and all except *dictatura* appear in the literature after the fall of the Empire. Of the 23 which do not appear in Italian, only nine appear in the literature after the fall of the Empire. All of the 9 have appeared in the literature before the fall of the Empire. This is significant. The words occurring most frequently in the literature before the fall of the Empire occur again in the literature after the fall of the Empire, and recur in Italian. Thus it appears that the majority of these words are either peculiar to the document (e. g. edict of Diocletian) where they are found, or that they were of very rare occurrence and had no permanent place in the popular speech. Likewise it appears that there was a closer relation between the literary language and the popular speech at the fall of the Roman Empire and even thereafter than has been usually supposed.

The fact that a larger percentage of the total number of words of this class in the language appears in inscriptions than of some other classes (Olcott, p. 52) is explained by their restriction almost exclusively to technical phraseology, in which inscriptions abound.

Cooper states that of all abstract substantives, those in *-tura* gained the least acceptance in the classical literature. In a sense this is true, but a limited number of these words is very common in all the classical literature; while the great majority, being technical terms, naturally found no wide general usage. This, however, in no way stamps them as vulgar words.

8. *Class with suffixes -monia and -monium.* Cooper (p. 36, with footnote 5), following a host of predecessors, states that substantives in *-monia* are too sparingly used[1] to be regarded as classic, and that they belong rather to the colloquial language, while those in *-monium* are to be consigned unhesitatingly to the *sermo vulgaris.* Plautus uses 4 of each class and 3 out of each 4 are used by Cicero. To the 3 in *-monium,* Cicero adds one form; to the 3 in *-monia,* he adds 2 found also in earlier writers and 2 not found in the earlier literature. The feminine forms predominated not in Cicero alone, but in the language as a whole (cf. for example, Tacitus), both classical and plebeian (as gauged by Italian). Of the 5 neuter forms corresponding to Cicero's feminine forms, not one appears in the literature for 200 years after Cicero's death, very rarely then, and not

[1] This statement appears to be ambiguous. If it means that the individual words in *-monia* which we have are sparingly used, it is erroneous, for the words in *-monia* used by Cicero are of frequent occurrence; if it means that the total in *-monia* is small it is not to the point, for that can only mean that as a formative element *-monia* was never fertile and produced but few forms.

one appears in Italian. Of the 11 feminine forms, all but one occur earlier than 43 B. C.; of the 20 neuter forms, 10 occur earlier than 43 B. C. Thus the number of words with each suffix in the literature up to this time was the same, 3 of the former being rare, 6 of the latter. Seven of the feminine forms and 5 of the neuter have found their way into the Italian. Of these 12 words which have become Italian, 10 are found in Cicero. The other 2, *mercimonium* and *alimonia,* are the only ones in Cooper's list of 21 non-classical words which have become Italian. Both of these are quite widely used in Latin. In Italian they are principally used as legal technical terms. Of Cicero's 11 words, 6 were used by Plautus, and all but *aegrimonia* have become Italian. The conclusion is evident. There existed in the language, in both the literary language and the popular speech, a very small number of both classes, the feminine forms slightly predominating; neither suffix was fertile as a formative element, however the late writers revived *-monium,*[1] but the words thus formed never found a place in the language at large.

9. *Classes with suffixes -ido, -edo, and -ela.* See Cooper, p. 46. The number of words occurring in Latin with these suffixes is so small that I hesitate to base any general arguments upon them, although such little evidence as they afford points in the same direction as that derived from classes 1-8 above. In particular all the classical words in *-ela* became Italian, being retained in the popular speech of the present day. Furthermore, of the 20 words in *-ela* found only in late writers but one (*sequela*) became Italian. Either words which are classical are also vulgar, and vice versa; or the Italian vocabulary is not the descendant of the vulgar speech but the classic.

[1] There is but one late form in *-monia* against 13 in *-monium.*

10. *Class with suffixes -itia, -ities.* Words formed with this suffix have been sometimes (perhaps even by the ancients) confused with those in *-ia* (*-ies*). The suffix *-ia* (*-ies*) was unproductive during the historical period,[1] but *-itia* (*-ities*) is a separate suffix in origin.[2] As it was productive after *-ia* (*-ies*) ceased to be, so it demands separate treatment. It was used to form abstract substantives from both noun and adjective stems. The two forms of the suffix *-itia* and *-ities* gave rise to frequent doublets. All must agree with Cooper (p. 48) that the majority of words in *-itia* are classical, and that the majority of those in *-ities* are not classical, but it is not true that, as he suggests, the words in *-ities* are probably to be attributed to the *sermo plebeius.* If the words in *-ities* were more numerous in the popular speech than in the classical literature, or if they were more numerous in the popular speech than forms in *-itia,* it is difficult to see why they were not so in the time of Plautus, and why they are not so today. In fact, our only evidence for the existence of more than a very few words in *-ities* is their rare occurrence in literature, chiefly the late literature. Cooper (pp. 49ff.) finds 27 words with the double form, 13 with only *-itia,* and 10 with only *-ities.*[3] Of the 40 forms in *-itia,* 30 have correspondng forms in the Italian. Of 37 forms in *-ities,* only 6 have corresponding forms in the Italian. The 6 Italian words are *calvizie, canizie, crassizie, mollize, planizie, segnizie.* Of these, 2 have forms in *-ezza* or *-izia, calvezza,* and *mollezza* or *mol-*

[1] The greater part of words of this class appear in all writers and most of them are very common words, therefore, Cooper finds nothing in them indicative of vulgar Latin, and passes them by. Slaughter merely enumerates without comment the ones found in comedy.

[2] Brugmann, Grundriss, vol. II, pt. 1 (2d ed.), p. 194.

[3] Additional words and Italian descendants are given in *App. xlii.*

lizia. For one of these words, only the form in *-ities* is found in Latin, viz. *crassities*. Three (*mollities, planities, segnities*) of the 4 words in *-ities* credited to Cicero are among these 6. For *lenities, tardities, vanities,* and *vastities,* which have no corresponding form in *-itia,* there are forms in Italian in *-ezza,* but they have the appearance of new formations. I have also compared the Spanish. For 17 of the forms in *-itia,* I find forms in *-ezza* or *-icia,* but for only 4 forms in *-ities* (4 out of the 6 that I found in Italian) do I find forms in *-ez* or *-icie.*

These facts must be interpreted to mean that the forms in *-itia* were the common ones both in the popular speech and in the literature, and that the forms in *-ities* were common neither in the popular speech nor in the literature. A large number of the forms in *-ities* are certainly archaisms.

V. Certain Works as Sources for Vulgar Vocabulary

1. Cicero's letters are often cited as a source for vulgar vocabulary, and it is not to be doubted that they are very near the popular speech. However, of over 2000 abstract substantives used by Cicero, only 71 fail to appear in his orations, or in his rhetorical or philosophical works (*App. xviii*). Only 22 are peculiar to his letters. Of these, 6 are diminutives, and 3 others (*facteon, appietas, lentulitas*) are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, known to have been coined by Cicero. Therefore the letters of Cicero, as a peculiar source for vulgar vocabulary of abstract substantives, are reduced to 13 words, if we except the diminutives. Only 4 of the 13 are found in Italian. Three (*aberration, compilation, inhibition*) of the 4[1] appear in French and reappear in English. All three are technical or scientific terms, and probably were taken directly from the literature at a late period (*aberra-*

[1] The fourth word is *devitatio.*

tion in the 18th century, the other two in the 15th). It appears more likely that these 13 words were coined by Cicero rather than found by him in the popular speech. Of the 71 used by Cicero only in his letters 49 are employed by other writers (*App. xviii*), 20 of these by earlier or contemporary writers. Four others are diminutives. Of the 49, 39 have become Italian, while of the 22 peculiar to Cicero only 7 have an Italian descendant. The 3 Italian diminutives (*lezioncella, commozioncella, possessioncella*) are undoubtedly new formations, and 3 other Italian words (see above, *aberratio,* etc.) are due to scientific influence. We have left one Italian word, whose Latin ancestor might be called vulgar and attributed peculiarly to Cicero's letters. The study of the 16 diminutives peculiar to Cicero, 6 peculiar to his letters, leads to corresponding results. In this way Cicero's letters give us just one abstract substantive, *devitatio,* peculiar to them, which is found in Italian where its presence does not appear to be due to scientific influence.

Plautus gives the same result for concrete as for abstract substantives, and I am confident that the letters of Cicero would do the same. But those who maintain that Cicero's letters are a source for vulgar vocabulary, also maintain that the popular speech made use of abstracts more freely than did the classic speech. Certainly then we should expect to find vulgar abstracts in any work whose vocabulary is vulgar. Still I believe that Cicero's letters are a source for vulgar vocabulary, and likewise all Latin literature. One work is more vulgar than another, not so much in its having more vulgar words as in its having less words which are purely literary, scientific, or technical.

2. Petronius is quite generally recognized as a vulgar writer. The fact that 89% of all the abstract substantives used by him are retained in Italian is evidence of this. Likewise his vocabulary is extremely classical, 89% being

found in Cicero. When from the 86 forms not found in Cicero (*App. xliii*), we subtract 20 Greek words, the result largely of Campanian influence, and over 50 more words that are used by other classical writers, Petronius as a peculiar source for vulgar vocabulary of abstract substantives is reduced to about 16. Cooper[1] finds him responsible for only 10 abstract substantives, and only 4[2] of these are retained in Italian. But I add *calvities* which I can find nowhere before Petronius. Suetonius has it and it is found in Italian. Of 493 abstract substantives common to Cicero and Petronius, only 28 fail to appear in Italian. When from 86 not found in Cicero, we subtract 30 classical but non-Ciceronian words; of the remaining 56, 38 fail to appear in Italian; and of 11 with which we meet first in Petronius, 6 fail to appear in Italian.[3] Petronius has 25 substantives in *-ntia* (*App. xi*), a so-called vulgar suffix. All appear in Italian, all appear in Cicero. He has 55 in *-tas* (*App. xv*), which has been called characteristic of an elevated style. All are classical and all have Italian descendants. The conclusion is evident. Petronius is a vulgar writer, i. e. he follows very closely the language of the whole people as used in daily conversation. His vocabulary is extremely classical.

3. Vitruvius is often cited as a vulgar writer, but we must remember that he is technical rather than vulgar. He has 43 substantives in *-tura* (*App. xxxvi*), 14 of them are Ciceronian; 11 of these are also in Italian. Of the remain-

[1] Cf. Cooper's lists of abstract substantives.

[2] *Gustatio, pensatio, conditura, gaudimonium.* None are peculiar to Petronius, but all are rare Italian words, probably only literary forms.

[3] *Sciscitatio, bonatus, seviratus, tristimonium, scabritudo, sopitio.* The second and last are doubtful readings and do not appear in my lists in the appendix. Cooper gives them.

ing 29 only 15 are in Italian. Of the 20 given by Cooper (p. 29) as non-classical, but 9 appear in Italian. The substantives in *-ntia,* as a class, being more general in their application, contain in their number a smaller percentage added by Vitruvius. He has 40 words in *-ntia,* 23 of these Ciceronian (*App. xi*); all 23 are in Italian; of the 17 remaining, 8 occur in Italian. In other words, of his forms in *-tura,* 32% are Ciceronian, 63% Italian; of his forms in *-ntia,* 57% are Ciceronian, 78% Italian. Compare the so-called vulgar Petronius who is non-technical and is more careful in his choice of words. Of his forms in *-tura,* 70% are Ciceronian, 94% Italian; of his forms in *-ntia,* 100% are Ciceronian, 100% Italian. We must conclude, therefore, that Vitruvius, as a technical writer, added a large number of words, mostly technical,[1] of which a large part never found a permanent place in the language. On the other hand, Petronius is a vulgar writer and writes in the language of the people, which is found to be extremely classical in vocabulary.

VI. PLAUTUS AND TERENCE COMPARED

Slaughter, I believe, has proven that Terence merited Caesar's praise as "*puri sermonis amator.*" He is certainly far more Ciceronian than Plautus; for the same reason also his vocabulary is nearer the people's than is Plautus'. Of substantives in *-tio,* as we have seen above, 73% of Plautus' became classical, 81% of Terence's; 63% of Plautus' have become Italian, 75% of Terence's; of substantives in *-tus,* 79%

[1] Every word of the class in *-tura* which Vitruvius uses and which is not found in Italian or in Cicero, is a technical term (*App. xxxvi-xxxix*). Though *-ntia* is not a technical suffix, nevertheless many of the words coined (or apparently so) by Vitruvius with this suffix are used by him in a technical sense (*App. xi*).

of Plautus' became classical, 84% of Terence's; 70% of Plautus' have become Italian, 80% of Terence's; of Terence's 21 substantives in *-ntia,* all are Ciceronian and all are found in Italian; of Plautus' 26, 19 are both classical and Italian, but of his 7 non-classical words, only one has become Italian.[1] Of Plautus' whole vocabulary of substantives, only 67%; while of Terence's, 84% have become Italian. Slaughter has shown us that Terence is more classical, more Ciceronian, and this fact shows us that he is also more vulgar than Plautus. Caesar's *purus sermo* demands words which are common in the language, both literary and popular. Plautus on the other hand employs words in large numbers which, so far as we have any evidence, have no existence outside of the works of Plautus, excepting those that were borrowed from him by a few later writers. At every point we are forced to the same conclusion; authors who are the most classical in vocabulary are also most vulgar. It is true of Terence who is regarded as a refined writer. It is true of Petronius whom all acknowledge as vulgar. The major part of every author's vocabulary is composed of words common to both the literary language and the popular speech. Some writers have very few words peculiar to them, others have large numbers. Words peculiar to one or a few writers are rare words, but they must not for this reason be declared vulgar, but only rare. We know that their occurrence is rare in the literature, and if they ever had any existence in the popular speech, they must have been of rare occurrence there; for we have noticed throughout that the majority of words which are common to a number of writers are preserved in Italian, while few or none of the words peculiar to one or a few writers ever find their way into the modern language.

[1] Cooper adds 3 to Rassow's list. None of the 3 have become Italian.

These considerations require that Olcott's statement (Introduction, p. xiv) be revised. "As regards word-formation, almost all that belonged to the *sermo classicus* was also a part of the popular speech, while on the other hand much that was vital in the latter was studiously avoided by the former." I should say that, as regards word-formation, almost all that belonged to the *sermo classicus* was also a part of the popular speech, and vice versa, excepting only that literary works, scientific and technical treatises often require words which the great mass of people never have occasion to use. This is in accord with the statement of Quintilian (10, 1, 9).[1] It is the natural condition and exists with us today. It is absurd to think that the vocabulary of the average man is larger than that of the literary man. The literary man, the scientific man, and the technical man have their technical vocabularies, and in addition they have, all in common, the general vocabulary of the average man. The words that were peculiar to a few are not in Italian, for the most part, excepting some scientific and technical terms. Terence, Petronius, and Plautus to a less degree show the general vocabulary of the average man. Vitruvius does not.

[1] *Omnibus enim verbis praeter pauca, quae sunt parum veracunda, in oratione locus est:* and the following.

APPENDIX

i. Words in *-io* in Caesar, admissible in hexameter.

condicio V H L,[1] deditio, dicio, legio V H, proditio V, ratio V H L, regio V H L, religio V H, seditio V H, statio V L.

ii. Words in *-io* in Horace.

condicio detestatio heiulatio indignatio legio occasio ratio regio religio seditio superstitio.

iii. Words in *-io* in Virgil.

condicio legio obsidio proditio ratio regio religio seditio statio superstitio.

iv. Words in *-io* in Horace, not admissible in hexameter.

detestatio heiulatio indignatio occasio.

v. Words in *-io* in Catullus.

allocutio ambulatio aprobatio argutatio basiatio cogitatio essuritio fututio inambulatio irrumatio locutio natio oratio ratio relligio vocatio.

vi. Words in *-tio* in Plautus and the duplicates in *-tus*. The forms in *-tus* are given followed by an indication of the name of the author in whose works they are first found. Forms in *-tio* can readily be supplied from the forms in *-tus*.

abitus P T, abortus T, captus T, cantus P, census P, compressus P T, frustratus P, natus P, oratus P, partus P T, quaestus P T, risus P T, accessus Cic, aditus Cic, ambitus Cic, ascensus Cic, auctus Cic, auscultatus App, cavillatus App, circumductus Quint, conlatus Auct B Hisp, distractus Just Inst, eiulatus Cic, erratus Ov, exitus Cic,

[1] Abbreviations: V(irgil), H(orace), L(ucretius), P(lautus), T(erence).

famigeratus App, inscensus App, interpellatus (late, rare), mutatus Tert, observatus Varr, obtractatus Gell, occasus Cic, postulatus Liv, potatus App, potus Cic, prolatus Tert, receptus Cic, reditus Cic, responsus Vitr, saltatus Liv, sortitus Cic, sponsus Cic, tactus Cic, unctus App.

vii. Words in *-tus* in Plautus, and the duplicates in *-tio*. The words in *-tio* are given and where first found, forms in *-tus* can be supplied from those in *-tio*. For both forms in Plautus consult list vi above.

allegatio Cic, aspectio Fest, arbitratio Gell, arcessitio Cyp, cibatio (late, rare), coetio Cic, complexio Cic, concubitio (very late), concursio Cic, conspectio (late, rare), cruciatio Vulg, cubitio (late), cultio Cic, cursio Va, datio Cic, delectio (late), despicatio Cic, dilectio Tert, ductio Vitr, exercitio Cato apud Gell, fluctio Plin, gestio Cic, habitio Gell, impulsio Cic, illectio Cassid, interventio (late), inventio Cic, iussio Dig, ludificatio Cic, magistratio App, memoratio Com Gall, mercatio Gell, nutricatio Gell, obsonatio (late), ornatio (late, rare), passio (late), piscatio Dig, plausio Cassid, portio Plin, pugilatio Cic, sortitio Cic, statio Cic, sumptio Cic, tonsio Vulg, usio (ante- and post-classic), venatio Cic, vomitio Cic.

viii. Words in *-tudo* found in Plautus with indication of their derivatives in Italian, Spanish, and French.

1. *Words not classical but revived by later writers:* albitudo maestitudo partitudo severitudo suavitudo tarditudo vanitudo. *None found in Italian, Spanish or French.*

2. *Other words not found in Cicero:* aritudo hilaritudo sorditudo canitudo macritudo saevitudo. *None found in the modern languages.*

3. *Words found in Cicero:* aegritudo I,[1] consuetudo I Sp, crassitudo I Sp, firmitudo, lassitudo 3, lippitudo I Sp, longitudo 3, pulchritudo Sp, solitudo 3, sollicitudo 3, turpitudo I Fr, valetudo I.

[1] "I" indicates that the word has an Italian descendent; "Sp" a Spanish, "Fr" a French. A figure three means "I, Sp, Fr." The absence of letter or figure indicates that there is no modern derivative.

4. *Words replaced by forms in -tas in the classical period, but revived later:* severitudo suavitudo tarditudo vanitudo orbitudo. Compare Italian *severita soavita tardita vanita orbita;* Spanish *severidad, suavidad, vanidad;* French *sévérité vanité;* all from Latin forms in *-tas.*

ix. Words in *-tio* found in Plautus and Terence with indication of their derivatives in Italian, Spanish, and French.

1. *Words not classical but revived by later writers:* abitio, auscultatio 3 (medical term), circumductio I Fr (rhet. term), conduplicatio 3 (rhet.), deambulatio I Fr (sci.), exclusio 3, frustratio Fr, indicatio 3, inscensio, integratio I Fr (math.), monstratio, palpatio I Fr (med.), partio, raptio, suaviatio, ventio.

2. *Other words not found in Cicero:* amatio I, aditio Fr, censio, clamitatio, congeminatio Fr (sci.), consuetio, edictio, exitio, expurgatio 3 (sci.), famigeratio, litatio, mutitio, parasitatio, pollicitatio (Caes) 3 (legal), pultatio, receptio (Cod Just) 3 (legal in Fr), risio, rogitatio, sorbitio Sp, subigitatio, suppositio 3, tactio Fr (rare), velitatio Fr (Latinism), verbivelitatio.

3. *Words found in Cicero:* abortio, accessio 3, adsentatio I, aedificatio 3, altercatio 3, ambitio 3, aratio I, ascensio 3, auctio I Sp, cantio I Sp, captio, cavillatio 3, cautio 3, certatio I, cessatio 3, circumitio I Fr, compressio 3, cognitio 3, coitio Sp, commemoratio 3, coniuratio 3, conlatio 3, consultatio 3, contio Sp, curatio 3, delectatio 3, deprecatio 3, dictio 3, discessio Fr, distractio 3, eiulatio I, erratio, excusatio 3, exspectatio 3, existumatio I Sp, factio 3, fraudatio, habitatio 3, inrumptio 3, interpellatio 3, inceptio, itio, lamentatio 3, lavatio I Sp, mansio 3, mentio 3, minatio, mutatio 3, narratio 3, natio 3, notio 3, observatio 3, obtrectatio I, occasio 3, oppressio 3, optio 3, oratio 3, pactio Sp, postulatio 3, potatio I Sp, potio 3 (Fr poison, potion), praedicatio 3, prolatio 3, pulsatio 3, purgatio 3, quaestio 3, ratio 3, reditio, responsio 3, revorsio, saltatio 3, seditio 3, sortitio I, simulatio 3, sponsio I, sollicitatio 3, unctio 3.

x. Words in *-tus* found in Plautus and Terence with indication of their derivatives in Italian, Spanish, and French.

1. *Words not classical but revived by later writers:* allegatus I Sp (legal), captus, concubinatus 3 (neologism in Fr), cubitus, datus, depeculatus, illectus, memoratus, neglectus, suasus, tonsus, vomitus I Sp.

2. *Other words not in Cicero:* astus cibatus contutus extersus frustratus inconsultus inventus ludificatus iniussus nutricatus obsonatus pedatus screatus.

3. *Words found in Cicero:* abortus I Sp, actus 3, abitus, adspectus 3, adventus 3, aestus, angiportus I, anhelitus I Sp, arbitratus I, arcessitus, artus I, cantus 3, casus 3, census 3, coetus I, commeatus I, complexus I, compressus, conatus I Sp, concursus 3, conspectus I Fr, conventus 3, crepitus I, cruciatus I, cultus 3, cursus 3, delectus I Sp, despicatus, dilectus I Sp, ductus I, eventus 3 (Fr event?), exercitus I Sp, fetus 3 (Fr fetus), fluctus I, fremitus I Sp, fructus 3, gemitus I Sp, gestus 3, gustus 3, habitus 3, iactus, ictus, impetus I Sp, impulsus I Sp, interventus I, iussus, luctus I Sp, luxus 3, magistratus 3, mercatus 3, natus, oratus, obitus I Sp, ornatus I Sp, paratus I, partus 3, passus 3, peculatus 3, piscatus, plausus I Sp, portus I, promptus, prospectus 3, pugilatus 3, quaestus, risus 3, ritus 3, ructus I, saltus 3, senatus 3, situs I Fr, sonitus I Sp, sensus I Fr, sortitus, spiritus 3, status 3, strepitus I Sp, sumptus I, suspiritus, tumultus 3.

xi. Words in *-ntia* in Cicero and also in other authors. Words marked thus (*) are not found in Italian.

absentia T Pe,[1] abstinentia T Pe S, abundantia T Vi S, affluentia T, adrogantia T Ca Vi, adulescentia T Ca Cato Va S, amentia Ca Vi S, appetentia, audientia, beneficentia T, benevolentia T Ca Va S, breveloquentia, clementia T Ca S, cohaerentia Vi, confidentia T Pe, conscientia T Ca S, consequentia, considerantia Vi, constantia T Pe Ca Vi S, continentia T Ca S, convenientia Vi, decentia, dementia T Pe S, *despicientia, differentia T Pe, diffidentia T S, diligentia T Pe Ca Cato Va S Vi, discrepantia Vi, *dissimulantia, distantia Vi, efficientia, elegantia T Pe Vi, eloquentia T Pe S Vi, eminentia, essentia, evidentia, excandescentia, excelientia Vi, experientia T Va, *exsuperantia, fidentia,

[1] For abbreviations see heading to list xiii.

flagrantia, frequentia T Pe Ca Vi S, haesitantia, ignorantia T Ca S, impotentia T Pe, imprudentia T Pe Ca S, impudentia T Ca Va S, inconsiderantia, inconstantia T, incontinentia, indegientia T, indiligentia Pe Ca Va, indolentia, indulgentia T Pe Ca, infantia T, infrequentia T, innocentia T Ca S, inscientia T Ca, insipientia, insolentia T Pe Ca S, instantia, intellegentia, intemperantia T, intolerantia T, invidentia, licentia T Pe Ca S, magnificientia T Vi, magniloquentia, malevolentia S, *negantia, neglegantia T Pe S, oboedentia, observantia T, patientia T Pe Ca Vi, perseverantia Ca, *perspicientia, pestilentia T Ca Pe Va S, petulantia T Pe S, potentia T Pe Ca S, *praenuntia, praesentia T S, praestantia, *profluentia, *prospicientia, providentia Pe Vi, prudentia T Pe Vi, redundantia Vi, repugnantia, reticientia, reverantia T, sapientia T Pe S Vi, scientia T Va Vi, sententia T Pe Ca Vi S, *suaviloquentia, temperantia T Ca, tolerantia, vigilantia T Vi, vinulentia T, violentia T.

In Tacitus, not in Cicero: *audentia, *impatientia, inclementia, inreverentia, iactantia, munificentia S, opulentia, paenitentia, poenitentia, *prodigentia, *properantia S, substantia, *truculentia, vaniloquentia.

In Caesar, not in Cicero: amantia, *obsequentia.

In Vitruvius, not in Cicero: *abstantia, *candentia, [concrescentia] (doubtful text), consonantia Tert, crescentia (cf. DuCange), decrescentia, *exconcrescentia, *extantia, indecentia Cael Aur, nascentia Vulg, obstantia (cf. DuCange), *pervolitantia, prominentia Cael Aur, resonantia, *subsidentia, *vehementia, *vomentia.

In Sallust, not in Cicero or Tacitus: loquentia, *luculentia.

xii. New words in *-ntia*, which have an Italian equivalent (cf. Cooper, pages 34-35).

Plinius: accidentia, corpulentia, malificentia.

Gellius: competentia, devergentia, exsultantia, exuberantia, maledicentia.

Apuleius: circumferentia, erubiscentia, praepotentia, refulgentia.

Tertullianus: apparentia, concupiscentia, delinquentia, disconvenientia, improvidentia, incongruentia, inconvenientia, in-

experientia, immoderantia, impraescientia, insuficientia, nocentia, praecellentia, praescientia, purulentia, reminiscentia, sufferentia, sufficientia, turbulentia.

Capitolinus: honorificentia.

Chalcidius: carentia, existentia.

Symmachus: convalescentia.

Ambrosius: recordantia.

Hieronymus: complacentia, dissonantia, impeccantia, impoenitentia, splendentia.

Augustinus: adiacentia, resistentia, resplendentia, somnolentia.

Boethius: aequosonantia, praevidentia, sequentia.

xiii. Words in *-or*, which do not occur in Italian, including the words of Pl(autus), Ci(cero), Ca(esar), T(acitus), Pe(tronius), Vi(truvius), S(allust), Va(rro), Cato, Ter(ence), L(ucretius).

plangor Ci L, paedor Ci L T, decor T Pe Vi, sonor T L, putor L Va, canor Pe L, frigor Va, stringor L, vagor L.

xiv. Table showing the relative number of words in *-tudo* and *-or*, in Plautus and Cicero, and in Caesar, Tacitus, Petronius, Vitruvius, Sallust, Varro, Cato, Terence. Words not in Italian marked thus: *.

1. *In Plautus, not in Cicero:* *albitudo, *aritudo Vi Va, *hilaritudo, *maestitudo, *parvitudo, *suavitudo Auctor ad Her, *severitudo, *sorditudo, *saevitudo, *tarditudo, *vanitudo.

claror, cremor Cato, algor T Vi, livor T Pe, sopor T Pe L.

2. *Common to Plautus and Cicero:* lippitudo, lassitudo Ca Pe S, turpitudo Ca S, crassitudo Ca Vi Va Cato, consuetudo Ca T Pe Vi S Va Ter, *firmitudo Ca T, longitudo Ca T Vi Va Cato Ter, solitudo Ca T Pe S Va Ter, sollicitudo Ca T S Ter, valetudo Ca T Pe Vi Va Cato, *pulchritudo T Pe Va Ter, aegritudo T Ter.

calor T Pe Vi Va Cato L, candor Pe Vi L, amor Ca T Pe Ter L, clamor Ca T Pe S Va Ter L, color Ca T Pe Vi Cato L, dolor Ca T Pe Vi Cato Ter L, error Ca T Pe Vi Cato Ter L, honor Ca T Pe Vi S Va Ter L, labor Ca T Pe Vi S Va Ter L, languor Ca T Pe Ter L, odor Ca T Pe Vi S Va L, pudor Ca T

Pe Vi S Va L, rumor Ca T Pe Vi S Va, sudor Ca T Pe L, terror Ca T Vi L, timor Ca T Pe Vi S Va Ter L, horror T Pe L, lepor T S L, liquor T Pe L, maeror T Ter L, nitor T Pe Vi Ter L, pallor T Vi L, pavor T L, rubor T Pe, splendor T Pe, Vi L, squalor T Pe L, tremor T Pe L, umor T Pe V Cato L.

3. *In Cicero, not in Plautus:* dissimilitudo T, *lenitudo T Vi, testudo Ca T Vi, altitudo Ca T Pe Vi S Va Cato, amplitudo Ca T Vi Va, fortitudo Ca T Pe S Ter, latitudo Ca T Vi S Va Cato, magnitudo Ca T Pe Vi S Va, mansuetudo Ca T S, multitudo Ca T Vi S Va, necessitudo Ca T Pe S, similitudo Ca T Pe Vi S Va, *anxitudo, beatitudo Pe, *concinitudo, dulcitudo, *lentitudo, *mollitudo V, *sanctitudo, vicissitudo Ter.

angor T L, ardor T Vi L, favor T Pe Vi S Va, fervor T Vi L, fulgor T L, fragor T Pe Va L, sapor T Pe Vi L, tepor T Vi L, tenor T Pe L, cruor T Pe L, *paedor T L, vapor T L, torpor T, furor Ca T Pe S L, clangor, *plangor L, stridor Pe Vi, stupor Pe Vi, tumor Pe, fetor, nidor L.

4. *Not in Cicero or Plautus:* *adsuetudo T, *amaritudo T Va, claritudo T S, habitudo Ter, *vastitudo Cato, *celeritudo Va, *pinguitudo Vi Va, *teneritudo Va, *acritudo Vi, *gravitudo Vi, *salsitudo Vi, *scabitudo Pe.

*decor T Pe Vi, rigor T Vi L, *sonor T L, vigor T Pe Vi Va, *frigor Va, *putor Va L, *canor P L.

Summary: For *-tudo*, total number 55; Pl, 23; Ci, 32; T, 23; Ca, 19; Pe, 12; Vi, 18; S, 14; Va, 17; Cato, 6; Ter, 9. For *-or*, total number 61; Pl, 33; Ci, 49; Ca, 15; T, 47; Pe, 37; Vi, 26; S, 11; Va, 13; Cato, 6; Ter, 10.

xv. Words in *-tas* in Cicero. Words in Petronius marked *.

acerbitas *adfabilitas adfinitas admirabilitas adsiduitas aduncitas aedilitas aequabilitas aequalitas aequalibritas aequitas *aestas aetas aeternitas aevitas agilitas alacritas ambiguitas amoenitas *antiquitas anxietas appietas asperitas atrocitas auctoritas aviditas beatitas benignitas *bonitas brevitas caecitas calamitas *calliditas capacitas caritas castitas celebritas *celeritas *civitas claritas comitas commoditas communitas concinnitas crebritas *crudelitas cruditas *cupiditas curiositas de-

bilitas *deformitas dicacitas difficultas dignitas diritas divinitas diuturnitas docilitas duritas *ebrietas ebriositas edacitas efferitas efficacitas egestas ecelsitas exiguitas exilitas *extremitas facilitas *facultas familiaritas fatuitas fecunditas *felicitas feritas ferocitas fertilitas festivitas fidelitas firmitas foeditas formositas fragilitas *frugalitas futtilitas gentilitas germanitas gracilitas granditas graviditas gravitas habilitas *hereditas hilaritas honestas hospitalitas *humanitas humilitas ieiunitas ignobilitas imbecilitas immanitas immaturitas immensitas immortalitas immunitas immutabilitas impietas impigritas importunitas *improbitas impunitas impuritas inanitas incolumitas incommoditas indignitas infelicitas infidelitas infinitas *infirmitas ingenuitas inhonestas inhospitalitas inhumanitas iniquitas iniucunditas inliberalitas innumerabilitas insanitas insulsitas integritas inutilitas iucunditas largitas latinitas laxitas lenitas lentulitas *levitas *liberalitas *libertas longinquitas *loquacitas magnanimitas *maiestas *maturitas medietas mediocritas *mendicitas mobilitas morositas mortalitas mulierocitas mutabilitas navitas *necessitas *nobilitas novitas obscenitas obscuritas opportunitas orbitas parvitas paucitas *paupertas pergrinitas perennitas pernicitas perpetuitas perspicuitas perversitas *pietas placabilitas posteritas *potestas pravitas probilitas *probitas procacitas proceritas proclivitas propinquitas proprietas prosperitas protervitas pubertas qualitas rapacitas raritas rivalitas sagitas *salubritas sanctitas *sanitas *satietas saturitas securitas sedulitas segnitas serenitas *severitas *siccitas simultas *societas sodalitas soliditas stabilitas *sterilitas stupiditas suavitas *subtilitas suburbanitas surditas taciturnitas tarditas *temeritas *tempestas tempestivitas tenacitas teneritas tenuitas timiditas *tranquilitas vacuitas *vanitas varietas vastitas uberitas velocitas venustas *veritas *vetustas vicinitas viduitas *vilitas virginitas viriditas vitiositas universitas *volubilitas *voluntas *voluptas *urbanitas utilitas.

Not in Cicero: *captivitas (also in Sen), *malignitas (also in Pl), *simplicitas (also in Ov).

xvi. Words in *-tio* used by Terence, for which there are corresponding forms in *-tus*.

abitio certatio circumitio cognitio coitio dictio discessio erratio itio monstratio mutatio narratio occasio oppressio oratio postulatio purgatio raptio reditio.

xvii. Words in *-tus* used by Terence, for which there are corresponding forms in *-tio*.

abitus abortus captus compressus conatus conspectus conventus cruciatus exercitus gestus impulsus mercatus ornatus paratus partus quaestus risus status suasus

xviii. Words in *-tio*, in the letters of Cicero, not found in his other works. Words marked with * are peculiar to Cicero, marked thus (†) are not in Italian.

*abberatio abrogatio adseveratio †*adsessio apparitio commisio *compilatio †consalutatio †*consurrectio †*convictio delegatio *devitatio dignatio †*efflagitatio errogatio impetratio impugnatio *inhibitio introductio †iocatio lavatio negotiatio pacificatio †*pellectio †*prensatio propertio reductio †*remigatio repraesentatio ruminatio satisfactio temptatio †velificatio.

xix. All other abstract nouns in Cicero's letters, which are not found in his other works.

abortus adsentatiuncula agilitas †*appietas †aegrimomia cariositas †captiuncula *commotiuncula edacitas †*facteon †*gloriola incommoditas inconsiderantia †*invitatus †*involatus †itus latinitas lautitia *lectiuncula †*lentulitas †levamen lippitudo †navitas †*nauseola negotiolum offensa *possesiuncula reflatus ructus †savium spectrum sponsalia sponsus suspiratus tricae vigintiviratus †vocula †*vulticulus.

xx. Words in *-tio* in Cicero and also in the following: Cato, Tacitus, Caesar, Varro, Petronius, Vitruvius, Sallust.

abalientio, aberratio, abiectio, abortio, abrogatio, abruptio, abscessio, absolutio T, abusio, acceptio S, accessio T Cato, acclamatio T, accomodatio, accretio, accubitio, accuratio, accusatio T, actio T Ca Vi S Pe, addictio, ademp-

tio, adeptio, adfectio T, adfirmatio T Ca, adflictatio, adgressio, adhaesio, adhortatio, adiunctio, adlegatio Vi, adlevatio, admiratio T Pe, administratio T Ca Vi, admixtio Va, admonitio, admotio, admurmuratio, adaptatio T S, adsectatio, adoptio, adsentatio T Ca, adsensio Pe, adseveratio T, adsessio, adsignatio, adsumptio, adversio, adulatio T Ca, adumbratio Vi, advocatio T Pe, aedificatio T Va Vi, aegrotatio, aemulatio T Pe, aequatio, aestimatio T Ca Vi, agitatio, agnatio, agnitio, alienatio T Ca, altercatio T, amandatio, ambitio T S Pe Va, ambulatio Va Pe Vi, admissio, amotio, amplificatio Vi, amputatio, animadversio T Ca Pe Vi, animatio, antecessio, anteoccupatio, anticipatio, apparitio Vi, appellatio T Ca Vi, apparatio, appetitio, applicatio, approbatio, appropinquatio, apricatio, aquatio Ca, aratio Va, argumentatio Vi, ascensio Vi, ascriptio, aspernatio, aspersio, aspiratio, asportatio, attentio, attributio, auctio Cato Pe, auditio T Ca Vi, auguratio, avocatio.

bacchatio.

cachinnatio, cantio Cato Vi, captatio, captio Vi, castigatio, cavillatio, cautio, celebratio T, certatio, cessatio, cessio, circumitio Vi, circumpotatio, circumscriptio, circumsessio, circumspectio, circumvectio, claudicatio, coaptatio, coacervatio, coagmentio Vi, coemptio, coercitio T, coitatio T Ca Pe Vi, cognatio T Va S, cognitio T Pe, cohortatio T Ca, coitio, commissatio T, commemoratio T, commendatio T Ca Vi S, commentatio, comminatio, commiseratio, commissio, commoratio, commotio, communicatio Vi, communitio Vi, commutatio T Ca Vi S Va, compactio Vi, comparatio T Pe Vi, compellatio, compensatio, compilatio, complexio, compositio T Ca Vi, compotatio, comprehensio, compressio Vi, comprobatio, concenatio, concentio, conceptio Vi, concertatio Vi, concessio T Va Pe S, conciliatio T, concisio, concitatio Ca Vi, conclusio Ca Vi, concretio, concursatio T, concursio, condemnatio, condictio, condonatio, conductlo, conexio, confectio, confessio T Pe, confictio, confirmatio Ca, conflictio, conformatio Vi, confusio T Pe, conglutinatio, congregatio, congressio, coniectio, coniugatio, coniunctio T Va Vi, coniuratio T Ca S, conlacrimatio, conlatio T, conlaudatlo, conlectio Pe, conligatio Vi, conlocatio Vi, conlocutio, conlusio, conquassatio, conquestio, conquisitio, consalutatio T, conscensio Ca, conscriptio Vi, consecratio T, consectatio,

consectio, consecutio, consensio, conservatio, consideratio Vi, consitio, consociatio, consolatio Pe, cosortio, conspiratio T, constitutio T Vi, constrictio, constructio, consultatio T S, consumptio, consurrectio, contemplatio Pe, contemptio T Ca, contentio T Ca Pe Vi S, contestatio, continuatio T Ca, contio T Ca Pe S, contortio, contractio Vi, contrectatio, conturbatio, conversio, convictio, convocatio, cooptatio, copulatio, correctio, corruptio T, creatio, cretio, criminatio T, cultio, cunctatio T Ca, curatio Va Pe Vi Cato.

damnatio T, datio Va Vi, debilitatio, debitio, decertatio, decessio, decisio, declaratio, declinatio Vi, declamatio T Pe, decoloratio, decuriatio, dedicatio, deditio T Ca S, deductio Vi, defatigatio Ca, defectio T Ca Vi S, defensio T Ca Vi S, definitio, deflagratio, deformatio Vi, degressio, deiectio Ca, delatio T, delectatio T Va Vi, delegatio, deliberatio T, deliratio, deminutio T Ca Vi, demissio Vi, demolitio, demonstratio, demutatio, denuntiatio Ca Pe, depopulatio, depravatio, deprecatio Pe, deprehensio, depulsio, derelictio, derivatio, derogatio, descensio, descriptio T Vi, desideratio Vi, designatio T Vi, despectio, desperatio T, despicatio, destitutio, determinatio, detestatio, detractio, detrectatio T Vi, devitatio, devotio T, dicatio, dictio T Ca Pe, digestio, dignatio T, digressio, diiudicatio, dilatio T, dimensio, dimicatio Ca, dimissio, dinumeratio, direptio T, diribitio, disceptatio, discessio T S, discriptio, disiunctio, dispensatio Vi, dispertitio Vi, dispositio Vi, disputatio T Ca Vi, disquisitio T, dissensio T Ca Vi S, dissignatio, dissimulatio T, dissipatio, dissolutio T Vi, dissuasio, distinctio T, distortio, distractio, distributio Vi, disturbatio, divinatio Pe, divisio Pe Vi S, dominatio T S, donatio T, dubitatio T S Vi.

editio T, educatio T, effectio, efflagitatio, effrenatio, effusio Vi, eiectio Vi, eiulatio, elatio Vi, electio T Vi, elocutio, emendatio T, emissio Vi, emptio T Va, enodatio, enumeratio, enuntiatio, ereptio, erogatio T, erratio Vi, eruditio T Vi, eruptio T Ca, eversio T, evolutio, evulsio, exactio T Vi, exaedificatio, exaggeratio, exanimatio, exceptio T Pe, excisio Vi, exclamatio T, excogitatio, excursio, excusatio T Ca Pe, exercitatio T Ca Va Pe Vi, exhalatio, existimatio T Ca Vi, exornatio, expeditio T Ca Vi S, expiatio, expilatio, explanatio, expletio, explicatio Vi, expolitio Vi,

exportatio T Vi, expositio, expostulatio T, expugnatio T Ca, expulsio, exsecratio T S, exsectio, exspectatio T Ca Pe Vi, exspiratio, exstinctio, exstructio, exsultatio T, extenuatio, exustio.

fabricatio Vi, factio T Ca Pe Vi S, faeneratio, festinatio T Ca Pe, fissio, flagitatio T, flexio, fossio Vi, fraudatio, frequentatio, functio, fusio Vi.

geminatio, gestio, gloriatio, gradatio, gratificatio, gratulatio T, gubernatio Ca.

habitatio Cato Pe Vi, haesitatio T, helluatio, hortatio, humatio.

iactatio T Pe, ignoratio T, imitatio T Pe Vi, imminutio, immissio, immoderatio, immolatio T, immutatio Vi, impeditio Vi, impetratio, implicatio, imploratio, impressio Va, improbatio, impugnatio, impulsio, inambulatio Vi, incensio, inceptio, incisio, incitatio T Pe Vi, inclusio, incursio, incusatio, indagatio Vi, indignatio T, inductio Vi, infinitio, infirmatio, infitiatio, inflamatio, inflatio Vi, inflexio, informatio, infractio, ingressio, inhibitio, inclinatio T Pe Vi, inlusio, inquisitio T, inrigatio Va, inrisio, inrogatio, inruptio T Ca, inscriptio T Pe, insimulatio, insinuatio, insitio Va Cato, instauratio, institio, institutio Vi, intentio T, interceptio, intercessio T Ca, interclusio, interdictio, interfatio, interitio Vi, intermissio Vi, interlellatio Pe Vi, interpositio Vi, interpretatio T, interpunctio, interrogatio T, interspiratio, introductio, invectio, inventio T Pe Vi, inversio, investigatio, inveteratio, invitatio, iocatio, iteratio Pe, itio, iudicatio, iugatio Va, iunctio.

laceratio, laesio, lamentatio T, lapidatio, lapsio, largitio T Ca S, latio, lavatio Va Vi, laudatio T Ca S, levatio Vi, libatio, liberatio, licitatio, ligurritio, lectio Pe, legatio T Ca S, locatio Va Vi, locutio, luctatio, lucubratio Cato, ludificatio, lusio, lustratio.

machinatio Ca Vi S, maledictio, mansio, manumissio, meditatio T, mensio, mentio T Pe, meridiatio, migratio Pe, minatio, miratio, miseratio T Ca Pe, missio T Ca Va Vi Pe, moderatio T Pe, molitio Pe Vi, monitio, motio Vi, multatio, munitio Ca Vi S, mutatio T Ca Pe Va Vi S, mutuatio.

narratio T Vi, natatio, natio T Ca Va Vi S, navigatio T Ca Vi, negatio, neglectio, negotiatio Pe, nominatio T Vi, notatio, notio T, nundinatio, nuntiatio.

obductio, obiurgatio Pe, oblectatio T, obnuntiatio, obrogatio, obscuratio, obsecratio T Vi, observatio T Vi, obsessio, Ca, obstinatio T, obstructio, obtemperatio, obtestatio T, obtrectatio T Ca, occasio T Ca Va Pe S, occatio, occisio, occultatio Ca, occupatio T Ca Vi, occursatio, odoratio, offensio T Ca Va, opinatio, oppressio Vi, oppugnatio T Ca Vi, optatio, optio T S, oratio T Ca Va Pe S, osculatio, ostentatio T Ca Pe S.

pacificatio, pactio T Ca S, partitio Va Vi, pastio Va, patefactio, pellectio, pensio Vi, peractio, peragratió, perceptio, percontatio T Ca, percursatio, percursio, percussio, peregrinatio T, perfectio Vi, perfunctio, pericilitatio, permansio, permissio, permixtio, permotio, permutatio T Pe, peroratio, perpessio, perpotatio, perrogatio, persalutatio, perscriptio, persecutio, persuasio T Pe, pertractio, perturbatio T, pervestigatio, pervigilitatio, petitio T Ca S, placatio, poenitio, porrectio Vi, portio T Cato Va Vi, possessio T Ca Vi S, postulatio, potio V Pe Vi, praecentio, praeceptio, praecursio, praedicatio, praedictio, praefatio, praegressio, praemeditatio, praemunitio, praenotio, praeparatio T Va Vi, praepositio, praesagitio, praescriptio T Ca Vi, praesensio, praetermissio, praetervectio, praevaricatio T, precatio T Pe, prensatio, privatio, probatio T Va Vi, processio, procrastinatio, procreatio Vi, procuratio T Ca Va, proditio T Ca S, productio, profectio T Ca, professio, progressio, prohibitio, proiectio, prolapsio, prolatio T Ca, prolusio, promissio, promulgatio, pronuntiatio Ca Pe Vi, propagatio Cato Vi, propensio, properatio, proportio Vi, propositio Pe, propugnatio, prorogatio, proscriptio T S, provisio, provocatio, publicatio, pulsatio, purgatio Cato Va, putatio Va.

quaestio T Va Pe Vi S, questio.

ratio S T Cato Va Vi Pe, ratiocinatio Vi, recensio, recitatio T, reclamatio, reconciliatio T, recordatio T Pe, rectio, recuperatio, recusatio Ca Pe, redemptio, reditio Ca, reductio Vi, reformidatio, refrigeratio, refutatio, reiectio, relatio T Vi, relaxatio, relegatio, relictio Vi, religatio, remansio, remigatio, remissio T Va Vi, remotio, remuneratio, renovatio, renuntiatio, repastinatio, repititio, replicatio, repraesentatio, reprehensio T, repromissio, repudiatio, respersio, respiratio, responsio, restinctio, restipulatio, re-

stituatio, retardatio Vi, retentio Vi, retractatio Vi, reversio, revocatio Vi, rogatio T Ca Va S, ruminatio, rusticatio.

sacrificatio, saltatio Pe, salutatio T Vi, sanatio, sanctio, satio Cato, satisdatio, satisfactio S, sauciatio, scriptio, secessio T Ca S, secretio, sectio T Va Vi, sedatio T, seditio Ca Va S, seductio, seiunctio, selectio, sessio, significatio T Ca Vi, simulatio T Ca Pe, sollicitatio Ca, solutio Ca Va, sortitio Va, spectatio Vi, spectio, spoliatio, sponsio Pe S, statio T Ca Va Pe, stipatio, stipulatio Va, suasio, subactio Vi, subductio Ca Vi, subiectio Vi, sublatio, subleviatio, subscriptio, subsortitio, substructio Vi, sucessio T Pe, suffragatio S, summissio, sumptio Cato Vi, superstitio T, suppeditatio, supplicatio T Ca Vi, supplosio, suppressio, superlatio Vi, susceptio, sustenatio.

tactio Vi, taxatio, temperatio Vi, temptatio, tergiversatio, terminatio Vi, testificatio, titillatio, titubatio, toleratio, tractatio Pe Vi, traditio T Va, traductio, traiectio Vi, transfusio, transgressio, transitio T Vi, translatio Va Vi, transmissio, transvectio, trepidatio T Pe, tributio, trucidatio, tuitio.

vacatio T Ca, vastatio T Vi, vaticinatio Ca Pe, vectio, velificatio, venatio T Ca Va Pe, venditio, venditatio T, veneratio T Va Pe, vexatio Pe, vindicatio, visceratio, visio, vitatio, vituperatio, unctio Cato Pe, vociferatio Pe, volutatio Pe, usurpatio, vulneratio.

xxi. Words in Tacitus, not in Cicero.

abolitio adfectatio adiectio adsimulatio comperendinatio conclamatio conglobatio coquisitio cosecratio consternatio contradictio conventio destinatio dissociatio efflagitatio exhortatio exploratio exprobatio exsecutio exundatio fatigatio frustratio imaginatio inritatio insectatio inundatio iurisdictio nuncupatio nutatio populatio positio praedatio propitio rebellatio reputatio separatio stimulatio subvectio ultio.

xxii. Words in Caesar, not in Cicero.

circummunitio conatio conclamatio contabulatio contignatio desperatio frumentatio lignatio obiectatio pabulatio pollicitatio populatio pressio tabulatio.

xxiii. Words in Cato and Varro (De r. r.), not in Cicero. Words marked thus * are agricultural terms.

concinnatio Cato, deportatio Cato, usio Cato, *admissio, *apertio, exemptio, *harundulatio, *hiematio, *nutricatio, *porculatio, *praegnatio, requisitio, *seminatio, *stercoratio.

xxiv. Words in Petronius, not in Cicero. Words marked thus * are not in Italian.

*catenatio *cellatio *cenatio coctio (also in Varro) destinatio (also in Liv) *epulatio *esuritio exhortatio (also in Tac) gustatio oscillatio pensatio (also in Quint) pollicitatio (also in Ca) *propinatio *sciscitatio *servatio *vilicatio *ultio.

xxv. Words common to Petronius and Cicero, but not in Italian.

ambulatio molitio volutatio contio.

xxvi. Words in Vitruvius, not in Cicero. Words marked * belong to the technical language of the architect and the astronomer.

*adiectio adportatio *aequilatatio *aggeratio *catenatio (also in Petronius) *circinatio *circulatio *circumactio *circumductio *coartatio *coaxatio *coctio (also in Varro and Petronius) *commodulatio *comportatio *concameratio *confornicatio *congestio *contabulatio (also in Caesar) *contignatio (also in Caesar) conversatio *correptio *decussatio *depalatio depressio dilatatio *directio disparatio *disseptio *ductio duplicatio erectio *exaequatio *examinatio exclusio *expertio expressio extentio *extructio *festucatio *fibulatio *figuratio *finitio *fistucatio *formatio *fornicatio *fundatio *gradatio *instructio *intersectio *involutio laxatio *levigatio *liberatio *lignatio *lineatio *loricatio lotio maceratio *materiatio ministratio mixtio *modulatio monstratio moratio multiplicatio *nodatio operatio ordinatio ornatio *palatio *percolatio *perductio *perlibratio *pinsatio *politio ponderatio portatio (also in Sallust) *praecinctio praecipitatio *praeclusio *pressio proclinatio profusio *quadratio recessio recognitio redundatio *refectio *rotatio *ruderatio scansio

*septio *solidatio *subgrundatio subvectio *sudatio *suffossio superatio *supputatio *suspensio *tabulatio (also in Caesar) *tentio *terebratio *trullissatio visitatio versatio.

xxvii. Words in Sallust, not in Cicero.

conventio pollicitatio (also in Caesar) portatio.

xxviii. Words in *-tus* in Cicero, Cato, Tacitus, Caesar, Varro, Petronius, Vitruvius, Sallust.

abitus T, abortus, abscessus T, abusus, accensus, accessus Va Vi, accitus T Pe, actus T Va Vi, adfectus T, adflatus Va Vi, aditus T Ca Pe Vi S, admonitus T Ca, adsensus T, adventus T Ca Va Vi S, advolatus, aestus T Ca Pe S, ambitus T Ca Pe S, anfractus T, anhelitus T, apparatus T Pe, appetitus, appulsus T, arbitratus T Pe S, arcessitus Ca, artus, ascensus T Ca Vi, aspectus T Va Vi Cato, auditus, auguratus T, cantus Pe Vi, capillatus, casus T Pe Vi S, census T Pe, circumitus Va Pe Vi, circumiectus, circumspectus, coactus, coeptus, coetus Pe Vi, comitatus T Ca Pe, commeatus T Ca Vi S, comperendinatus, complexus T S, compressus, conatus T Vi, concentus, conceptus Va, concessus T Ca, concubitus T Pe, concursus T Ca Pe S, conflictus, congestus, congressus T Ca Vi S, coniectus T, consensus T Ca Pe Vi, consessus T, conspectus T Va Pe Vi S, consulatus T, contextus P, conventus T Ca Vi, convictus T Pe Vi, crepitus P Vi, cursus T Pe Vi S, cultus T Ca Pe, decemviratus, decessus T, decursus T Vi, defectus, delectus T, despicatus, digressus T, dilectus, diremptus, discessus T Ca, dominatus, domitus, ductus T S, duumviratus, effectus, efflagitatus, egressus T Ca Pe S, eiulatus T, equitatus Ca S, eventus T Ca Vi, excessus T, exitus T Ca Pe Vi, exorsus, exercitus T Ca Va Pe Vi S, exortus, explicatus, fletus T Pe, flexus T Vi, foetus Va, fluctus T Pe Ca Vi, flatus Va Vi, fremitus T Ca, fructus Cato Va Pe Vi, gemitus T Pe, gestus T Vi, gustatus, gustus T Pe, habitus Pe S, haustus T Pe, hiatus T Va Pe, hinnitus T, hortatus T Ca, iactus T Ca, ictus T Pe, impetus T Ca Pe Vi, impulsus T Vi S, incessus Pe, incestus, incursus Ca Vi, inductus, inflatus, ingressus T Ca Vi, instinctus T, intellectus T Vi, intentus, interductus, interiectus T, in-

interitus Ca, interpositus, interventus T Pe Ca, introitus Ca Vi, invitatus, involatus, itus Vi, iudicatus, iussus T Ca Cato S, laniatus, lapsus T, lessus, luctus T Ca S, luxus T Pe, magistratus T Ca Pe Vi, mandatus, mercatus T, metus T Pe Vi S, missus T Ca, morsus T Va Pe, monitus T, motus T Va Pe Vi, mugitus, natus T Va, nexus T, nisus T Pe Vi, obiectus T, obitus T, obtutus, occasus T Vi, odoratus, oppositus, oratus, ornatus Vi, orsus, ortus T Ca Pe Vi, paratus T S, partus T Pe Vi, passus T Vi, pastus T, peccatus, peculatus T, peditatus T Ca, pelicatus, permissus T, persuasus, piscatus Va Vi, plausus, ploratus T, pontificatus T, portus, potentatus Ca, potus T Va Vi, praegressus, praetextatus Pe, pressus, principatus T Ca Vi, processus, procinctus, progressus T Vi, promptus T Pe S, prospectus T Vi S, pugillatus, pulsus T Vi, quaestus T Pe Vi, questus T, quinqueviratus, raptus T, ratus, receptus T, recessus T Ca Pe Vi, reditus T Ca Va Vi S, reflatus, regressus T Vi, respectus T, respiratus, risus T Pe, ritus T Pe, rogatus, ructus Vi, saltus T, saliatus, satus, senatus T, sensus T Pe Vi, septemviratus, seviratus Pe, sexus, singultus T Pe, situs T Ca, sonitus T Pe Vi S, sortitus, spiritus T Va Pe Vi S, sponsus, status T Pe Vi, strepitus T Va Pe, sumptus T Ca Vi S, suspiratus, tactus Pe Vi, tortus, tractatus, tractus T S, transitus T Ca Pe Vi, tribunatus T, tritus, triumviratus T, tumultus T, venatus T, versus T Pe Vi, vestitus T Vi, victus T Va S, vigintiviratus T, visus T Pe Vi, vocatus, volatus T, usus T Pe Vi, voltus S.

xxix. Words in *-tus* in Tacitus, not in Cicero.

adcursus adgestus adnexus advectus aeditus amplexus astus auctus (also in Vitruvius) candidatus centurionatus concentus contactus contemptus[1] cruciatus derisus despectus discursus escensus excursus fastus fiatus halitus incussus inrisus intercursus lanitus lusus[1] meatus[1] obtentus occursus planctus[1] positus praetextus[1] proconsulatus procursus profectus provisus relatus secessus[1] semotus successus suggestus (also in Cato) superventus tinnitus traiectus ululatus usitatus vagitus.

[1] Also in Petronius.

xxx. Words in *-tus* in Caesar, not in Cicero.

conspectus deiectus despectus (also in Tacitus) editus iniussus (also in Cato) munitus proventus.

xxxi. Words in *-tus* in Varro, not in Cicero.

contractus discensus frictus iniussus (also in Caesar) nutricatus nutus observatus stratus successus (also in Tacitus).

xxxii. Words in *-tus* in Petronius, not in Cicero or Tacitus.

attonitus aussus gressus latratus.

xxxiii. Words in *-tus* in Petronius, not found in Italian.

aestus ausus capillatus contemptus gressus ictus iussus metus quaestus seviratus.

xxxiv. Words in *-tus* in Vitruvius, not in Cicero or Tacitus.

adiectus hullitus commensus comparatus concentus conexus contractus descensus emersus expressus nutus percursus percussus perfectus perflatus perspectus significatus sultus supergressus suspectus.

xxxv. Words in *-tus* in Sallust, not in Cicero.

consultus contactus excubitus inclutus iniussus nutus.

xxxvi. Cognate words in *-tura* and *-tio* in Vitruvius Words marked thus * are found in Italian, marked thus † in Cicero. All the pairs show differentiation in meaning.

compactura, *compactio; conclusura, *conclusio; *contractura, *contractio; directura, *directio; fossura, *fossio; materiatura, materiatio; *politura, politio; †praecinctura, *praecinctio; *temperatura, *temperatio; traiectura, traiectio (incendiorum); *coctura, *coctio; suspensura, *suspensio.

xxxvii. Words in *-tura* in Vitruvius, for which the language shows cognates in *-tio*. Those marked (c) have concrete meaning.

*apertura (c) †commissura (c) *corporatura (c) *curvatura (c) *flexura (c) *fractura (c) fricatura (c) inversura (c) *iunctura (c) *proiectura (c) †*scriptura (c) †*structura (c) †*vectura (vectio is rare) †*statura (entirely differentiated from statio) †*natura (entirely differentiated from natio) †*mensura (mensio is rare).

xxxviii. Other words in *-tura* used in a concrete sense by Vitruvius.

fartura *foliatura fultura membratura †*pictura scalptura *sculptura.

xxxix. The remaining words in *-tura* in Vitruvius.

†*architectura *calcatura flatura †*litteratura †*praefectura †*sepultura striatura †versura.

xl. Words in *-tura* in Cato.

*commissura conmixtura *conpostura *cultura *fractura *natura *vectura.

xli. Words in *-tura* in Varro (De r. r.).

admissura carptura *coniectura *cultura fartura *figura *fetura *natura partura *tonsura *tritura *usura *vectura *velatura volatura vulsura.

xlii. Doublets in *-itia* and *-ities* and the Italian equivalents. Words in Petronius marked thus: *.

*amicitia	amicities	amicizia	
amaritia	amarities	amarezza	
	almities		
avaritia	avarities	avarizia avarezza	
	albities		
*blanditia	blandities	blandizia	
calvitia	*calvities	calvezza	calvizie
canitia	canities		canizie
	crassities		crassizie
duritia	durities	durezia durezza	
immunditia	immundities	immondizia immondezza	

impigritia			
impudicitia		impudicizia	
impuritia		impurezza	
inimicitia		inimicizia	
iniustitia		ingiustizia	
iustitia		giustizia	
longitia			
	lenities	lenezza	
lentitia	lentities	lentezza	
laetitia	laetities	letizia	
latitia			
*lautitia		lautezza	
maestitia		mestizia	
malitia	malities	malizia	
	magnities		
mollitia	mollities	mollezza mollizia	mollizie
munditia	mundities	mondezza mondizia	
*nequitia	nequties	nequizia	
nigritia	nigrities		
notitia	notities	notizia	
	pullities		
*pigritia	pigrities	pigrezza pigrizia	
pinguitia	pinguities	pinguezza	
planitia	planities		planizie
pueritia	puerities	puerizia	
*pudicitia		pudicizia	
puritia			
	recalvities		
*saevitia	saevities	sevizia	
segnitia	segnities		segnizie
scabritia	scabrities	scabrezza	
sorditia	sordities		
spurcitia	spurcities		
stultitia	stultities	stoltezza stoltizia	
surditia		sordezza	
	tardities	tardezza	

*tristitia	tristities	tristezza tristizia
	vanities	vanezza
	vastities	vastezza

xliii. Abstract substantives found in Petronius. A few words originally abstract, but used concretely by Petronius, are found in this list, but they cannot effect our results. For words in *-tio*, *-tus*, *-tas*, *-tudo*, *-or*, *-ntia* and *-itia*, see lists already given. Words marked thus * are not in Italian, those marked thus † are not in Cicero.

(1) Words in *-tura:*

commissura †conditura coniectura figura *flatura iactura mensura †mixtura (also in Lucretius) natura pictura scriptura statura †strictura (also in Virgil) †sutura (also in Livy) sepultura vectura.

(2) Words in *-ia:*

augustiae audacia concordia controversia contumacia contumelia custodia delicia desidia discordia divitiae †facundia (also in Terence) fallacia fiducia gloria gratia ignavia *indutiae inedia ineptia inertia iniuria inopia insania insidia invidia iracundia luxuria materia memoria militia miseria misericordia *nuptiae pertinacia philologia philosophia praecordia ? (-um) superbia symphonia verecundia *vicinia victoria †vindemia.

(3) Words in *-ium:*

†*alloquium arbitrium artificium augurium auspicium auxilium beneficium colloquium compendium concilium *confinium consilium †consortium (also in Livy) contubernium desiderium †diverbium effigium elogium exilium fastidium flagitium gaudium †homocidium hospitium imperium incendium indicium ingenium initium insomnium iudicium *iurgium latrocimium ludibrium mancipium mendacium †*methodium ministerium naufragium navigium negotium obsequium †*odarium odium officium otium †*pervigilium praemium pretium principium *proelium proverbium remedium sacerdotium sacrificium servitium silentium solacium somnium studium suffragium

supplicium vitium veneficium taedium suspirium suspendium gaudimonium tristimonium testimonium.

(4) Other abstract nouns unclassified:

aerumna †ambages (also in Virgil) †*anathymaisis †*alogia anima animus argumentum ars †astronomia bellum blandimentum *caedes †calvities (also in Suetonius) carmen †catastropha causa certamen †chaos †*choea clades †*colaphus constitutum cordax crimen culpa cupido cura damnum decretum diaeta dialectica dolus (domusio?) edictum experimentum facinus factum fama fames fas †fascinum (also in Horace) fatum †fermentum (also in Virgil) fides *foedus fomentum forma formula fors fortuna fraus frigus fuga furia †gelu (also in Lucretius) †genesis †genius (also in Virgil) genus geometria †*halosis *impensa interdictum †*interpretamentum iocus ius iuventus laus lex libido lis lucrum ludus lues lux mens messis momentum mora mors mortus *mos murmur nomen †noxa (also in Caesar) numen numerus *obrussa offensa *omen onus opera *ops *opus osculum paralysis pax pensum periculum †*peristasis †phantasia plaga poena pondus praeceptum praescriptum prex pugna querella rabies †regimen (also in Livy) religio responsum retorica rixa *robur sacramentum salus scelus †schema *scita †*scordalia †*selibra senecta senectus *sententiola sermo servitus sexus sibilus sitis somnus sonus spes †*sponsiuncula stropha stuprum †suasoria (also in Quintilan) †*suaviuncula testamentum †*tonitrus †*tonstreinum tragoeda triduum triumphus †*tropica turbo tutela venus virtus vicis *vis vita vox.

THE USE OF THE ADJECTIVE AS A SUBSTANTIVE IN THE DE RERUM NATURA OF T. LUCRETIUS CARUS.*

The transfer of a word ordinarily used as an adjective to the function of a substantive, involves one of the most common shifts of category that occur in language, and is abundantly illustrated by all the Indo-European languages. So among the Romans, as new substantive concepts arose new expressions developed for them. Of the various new forms that thus arose the substantivized adjective is one of the most important and most interesting, ,whether viewed from the point of view of general linguistics or treated as a factor in the historical development of the Latin language.

The use of the Latin adjective as a substantive has been made the subject of a great deal of study. Those who devoted attention to the subject in the earlier part of the past century approached it with minds seriously prejudiced in two respects. First, as they were interested in it mainly for the light it threw on "good usage" and "bad usage," they looked at the phenomenon mainly from the point of view of the stylist. In the second place they were still largely swayed by the "logical" method of language study, which had sharply and clearly defined the respective provinces of the adjective and the substantive, and they accordingly viewed with disapproval any "intrusion" of the former upon the field of the latter. It was an offense against the principles of grammar as well as a violation of good style.

* Additions by the editor are enclosed in single quotation marks reversed, thus: ‚.....'

Even a man of the type of Christian Karl Reisig makes the following remarkable statement:[1] " Es hat die Sprache eine Menge Redensarten, wo das neutrum adjectivi für ein substantivum gesetzt ist, erst almählich gebildet. Zuerst war dies mehr dichterisch; seit dem ersten Jahrhundert der Kaiser wurde es in der Prose immer allgemeiner; z. B. *in levi habendum* bei Tac. Ann. 3,54, *primas dominandi spes in arduo* (*esse*) Ann. 4,7. Auch früher schon hat Sallust, der überhaupt manches Dichterische anwendet, *in incerto* Cat. 41,1."

In 1837 C. G. Dietrich published a brief paper in the Zeitschrift f. Alterthumswissenschaft, Nr. 44, pp. 367ff., and treated the same subject in greater detail in the Easter program of the gymnasium at Freiburg in 1842. This paper was reprinted in Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Paed. suppl. vol. 8, pp. 487-503 (= Archiv. f. Phil. u. Paed.). While Dietrich still viewed the question with the eyes of a stylist and bases his conclusions almost exclusively on the usage of Cicero (he cites scarcely more than half a dozen passages from Sallust, Nepos and Livy), yet to him is due the credit of having pointed out the frequency of this usage, which others had regarded as confined to a comparatively small number of words and to a few special phrases. He took a decided stand: " *omnia fere* (sc. *adiectiva*) *pro substantivis usurpari posse existimarem, si quidem ex ipsa verborum compositione satis intelligitur adjectiva habere vim substantivorum.*" During the succeeding thirty years Nägelsbach's Stilistik (1st ed. 1846, 3d 1858, 4th 1861), Holtze, Syntaxis priscorum scriptorum Latinorum usque ad Terentium, 1861, 1862 and Draeger's Historische Syntax der lat.

[1] Vorlesungen über lat. Sprachwissenschaft (first published in 1839 by his pupil Fr. Haase and re-edited in the 80's by Heerdegen, Schmalz and Landgraf), vol. 3, pp. 159ff.

Spr. vol. 1, 1872 (2d ed. 1878) added considerable new material from other writers than Cicero and introduced a more elaborate classification of the material.

In 1874 appeared two works which made substantial contributions to the subject: Haase, Vorlesungen über lat. Sprachwissenschaft, vol. 1, ed. by Eckstein and Ott, Die Substantivierung des lat. Adjectivum durch Ellipse, Program, Rottweil. The former dealt a heavy (and final) blow to those who had made extravagant use of the ellipsis as an explanation of origin of substantivized adjectives, while Ott pointed out a large group of instances, in the case of which one is justified in assuming that an ellipsis has been involved in the development of the usage. Ten years later Panhoff,[1] Barth,[2] and Wueseke [3] enriched the available material by somewhat exhaustive papers on the usage of Tacitus, Terence and Plautus, and in 1890 Hirt added the material supplied by Quintilian.[4] The special line of work opened up by Ott in the above-mentioned program was followed out by Wölfflin, Die Ellipse von *navis* [5] and Rolfe, Die Ellipse von *ars* [6] and The Formation of Latin Substantives from Geographical Adjectives by Ellipsis [7] in the thorough and exhaustive manner characteristic of the school of Wölfflin.

[1] Panhoff, De neutrius generis adiectivorum substantivo usu apud Tacitum, Diss. Halle, 1883.

[2] Barth, Die Eleganz des Terentius im Gebrauch des Adjectivums, in Jahr. Class. Phil., vol. 129 (1884), pp. 177-182.

[3] Wueseke, De Plauti et Terentii usu, adjectiva et participia substantive ponendi, Diss. Marburg, 1884.

[4] Hirt, Ueber die Substantivierung des Adjectivums bei Quintilian, Program des Sophiengymnasiums, Berlin, 1890.

[5] Archiv. Lat. Lex. vol. 9 (1896), pp. 285-291.

[6] Archiv. Lat. Lex. vol. 10 (1898), pp. 229-246.

[7] Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc. vol. 30 (1899), pp. 5-23.

The aim of the present paper is to throw additional light upon the subject by the examination of the usage of Lucretius.

Since the publication of Ott's paper it has been customary to distinguish rather sharply between two processes by which substantives are developed from adjectives. Ott (p. 1) defines them as follows: "Die Substanvierung des lateinischen Adjectivs vollzieht zich auf einem doppelten Wege: entweder durch unbewusste Subsumption eines persöhlichen oder sächlichen (abstracten) Begriffes unter einem obersten Allgemeinbegriff oder durch fühlbare Ellipse eines ebenfalls generellen, aber enger begrenzten Begriffes von weit überwiegend concreter Natur," e. g. first type: *consularis* 'an exconsul,' *boni* 'the good,' *docta* 'a lady of culture,' *honestum* 'integrity.' . . . "Der Hergang bei der erster Art Substantivierung ist dem nach ein innerer, in den Elementen des Wortes selbst gelegener. Diese Elementen sind (1) die im Stamm ruhende Bedeutung des Wortes, (2) bei abgeleiteten Adjectiven zugleich die zum Ausdruck bestimmter Verhältnisse dienenden Suffixe, (3) die Geschlechtsbezeichnung . . . . Was nun die zweite Art der Substantivierung betrifft, so ist hier der Hergang äusserlich, nicht in Elementen des Adjectivum selbst begründet, er besteht, nämlich in dem Wegfall eines allgemeinen Substantivbegriffes, der sich zum Adjectivbegriff verhält wie das Genus zur Species."

,This division of substantivized adjectives into two classes, while it is in some respects convenient for the purposes of systematic classification and description, has been rather too sharply drawn heretofore, and has tended to obscure at least partially the real nature of the processes involved in the change. In the first place we should never lose sight of the fact, that the grammatical function of a word is only one of the many elements or groups of ele-

ments of thought and feeling that constitute the complex meaning it bears in any given sentence in which it may occur. For example, in handling the problem now before us, we should distinguish carefully between the processes involved in the shift of grammatical category (from adjective to substantive) on the one hand and those involved in a change of what is ordinarily called the "meaning"[1] of a word on the other. While the two are concomitant in probably all cases, yet the one is not an indispensable prerequisite to the existence of the other. The word *molaris* from continued use in connection with *dens* "absorbed" a part of its meaning, that is, certain elements in the meaning of *dens* became closely associated with the phonetic symbol *molaris,* a semantic change of very common occurrence and variously called *Verdichtung, contagion,* fusion or saturation,[2] itself a process involving several successive stages. We should be much in error, however, if we should suppose that it was through association with the word *dens* alone that *molaris* came to be associated with the objects with which English *molar* is associated when used of the teeth. In that case we should be overlooking the fundamental truth that in each and every instance the meaning of a word has its origin in the sentence as a whole, or even in the wider context, and that not simply one element of the sentence (e.g. in this case the word *dens*) is responsible for its meaning. Take for example Juvenal, Sat. 13,213.

> Perpetua anxietas nec mensae tempore cessat
> Faucibus ut morbo siccis interque molares
> Difficili crescente cibo.

[1] The shift of grammatical category is of course in this instance fundamentally a change in meaning.

[2] See Wundt, Völkerpsychologie, I,2, chap. 8,§5a (=pp. 537ff. 1st ed.); Bréal, Essai de semantique, p. 221 (=pp. 200ff. Engl. translation); Darmesteter, La vie des mots, p. 124, 2d ed.

It is by the general meaning of the sentence (note the words *mensae, faucibus, crescente cibo*) that the meaning of *molares* is determined. This is made clear by a comparison of Pliny, Nat. Hist. 36,174f.

Calcem e vario lapide Cato censorius inprobat; ex albo melior. . . . . Utilior eadem effosso lapide quam ex ripis fluminum collecto, utilior e molari, quia est quaedam pinguior natura eius; 36,137 Molarem quidam pyriten vocant, quoniam plurimum sit ignis illi . . . .; Celsus, 5,28 lapide molari contrito; Virgil, Aen. 8,249f. (description of the slaying of Cacus by Hercules)

> Desuper Alcides telis premit (sc. Cacum) omniaque arma
> Advocat et ramis vastisque molaribus instat,

'huge rocks'; cf. Ovid, Met. 3,59f. (description of the slaying of the dragon by Cadmus)

> Dixit, dextraque molarem
> Sustulit et magnum magno conamine misit;

and Apuleius, Met. 7,17, where the meaning of *molares circuitus* is made clear by the words of chap. 15 *mulier molae machinariae subiugum me dedit* and *mercenariis discursibus meis.*

In these six passages *molaris* is used in at least five distinctly different senses. Four different meanings of the word are known as applied to stones; i. e. 'mill stone,' any 'large stone,' 'flint,' 'marcasite.' Clearly association with the word *lapis* alone would not explain these various meanings. Once the word has come to be closely associated with the groups of qualities possessed by the various objects symbolized by it in the above sentences, it may be used either as an adjective or substantive, just as the Romans said either *homines consulares* 'men of consular rank,' 'exconsuls' or *consulares.* The shift from the former meaning to the latter (i. e. the shift of grammatical category) involves a different problem from that discussed above and appears

to be essentially the same in both the classes of words described by Ott. In any case it can not be said that the substantivizing is the result of the omission of the substantive, any more than that the omission of the substantive is due to the substantivizing of the adjective.

In the statement of Ott as to the manner in which *consularis, boni, docta,* and *honestum* take on substantive meaning he leaves out of account in the same manner the part played by the context in the problem. The "elements of the word itself" are not more important than the other elements of the unit of thought (sentence) of which it is a part. The conditions under which a word of this class appears with a specific "meaning" are only slightly different from those under which *molaris* and words of its class take on theirs. In the latter class some specific word as *dens, lapis* plays a large part, in the former class this is not so likely to be true. The shift from adjective to substantive is not conditioned by this change of meaning, but is a concomitant process, which may or may not take place.

Professor Rolfe appears to have recognized the real error of Ott's method, for he says in Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc. vol. 30, p. 6, "To ellipsis clearness is sometimes apparently sacrificed. . . . . With *argentaria,* for example, we may think of the mine (*fodina*), of the workshop (*officina* or *taberna*), of the bank (*mensa*), or of the banking business (*ars*). The sacrifice of clearness is, however, only apparent, since the particular substantive which is to be supplied in each case is plainly indicated by the situation in which the word is used." This apparent ambiguity, or to speak more accurately, this variety of meaning exists, of course only in the mind of the grammarian or lexicographer who is studying the word. In the mind of the Roman who was employing the word for the purpose of expressing his ideas, normally there was in each specific instance but *one* meaning;

and it is only with the mental processes involved in that one meaning that the student of Latin syntax and semantics has to do.'

In the present paper in dealing with the adjective converted into a substantive as found in the De rerum natura of Lucretius the subject is treated for the sake of convenience under the two heads mentioned above. For the first mentioned class, that is, "without ellipsis," I follow the classification of Nägelsbach amplifying it where necessary. In the second division I have made such a classification as seemed appropriate.

CLASS A.

Adjectives by inflection in gender and number, in connection with the context in which they stand, denote, in the masculine, males or animate beings (especially persons) generally; in the feminine, females; in the neuter, things. Such adjectives acquired the force of substantives (e. g. *amicus, inimicus, bonum, docta*) and did not derive their meaning chiefly from an omitted substantive, the morphological elements and the situation furnishing the conditions necessary to make evident the specific meaning and the substantive character. When such a usage comes to be the prevailing or exclusive one, the adjective becomes a substantive.[1]

There are various stages in this transition from one usage to the other, from that in which the substantive use is suggested by a real substantive or some other word standing in close proximity to the adjective, while, in the common usage, the adjective retains its full adjectival force, to that in which the adjective has become a real substantive and is only sporadically or never used with its adjectival force.

[1] See Rolfe, Trans. p. 7.

To illustrate these facts in a concrete form I will take the adjective *publicus,-a,-um.* In the early language these forms were prevailingly, if not exclusively, used with substantives of the masculine, feminine and neuter genders to designate males, females, and objects of the neuter gender respectively as possessing the attributes signified by the adjectives. Thus, while *publicus,* because of its connotation of sex might be used of any public man, that is, an officer, a magistrate or a slave, the adjective was used to such an extent in the phrase, *publicus servus,* that, when a Roman said *publicus* in a certain context, a friend understood what he meant even if he failed to add *servus.* This usage continued, the word *servus* being dropped more and more frequently, until finally, *publicus* came to mean 'public slave.' [In Plautus, Truc. 557 *metuit publicos,* although the passage is a disputed one, we probably have *publicus* used with the meaning of 'public officer' or 'policeman.' Orelli, Inscr. 3,6,7,3 *publicus sacerdotalis, a sacris, a sacrario divi Augusti* gives *publicus* as meaning a lower servant of a priestly college.]

Now just as *publicus* conveyed the proper meaning by its masculine termination supported by the situation, so *publica* with a feminine ending is seen to have been used as a substantive and to have been associated with the idea of a public woman. Seneca, Epist. 88,37 has *Sappho publica fuerit* where undoubtedly such is the correct interpretation. *Publica* in addition, however, through the association with the word *via,* on the subsequent ellipsis of that word, came to express the idea embraced in the combined adjective and substantive *publica via;* e. g. Gromatici Lat. p. 334,16. This ellipsis becomes intelligible to us when we know the environment of the substantive.

Publicum when used as a substantive does not indicate so clearly as in the other instances the idea by means of its

inherent characteristics. Here the meaning generally depends more upon the situation. So in some cases *territorium, agrum* are the words (or concepts) which must have been in the mind of the speaker, in others *vectigalia, bonum* etc. for example, Cic. Agr. 2,82 *in publicum Campanum* where *publicum* is equivalent in meaning to the state's purse, expense. In Cic. Verr. 3,105 *Apronium . . . . imperasse, ut in medio foro sibi lecti sternerentur, cotidie solitum esse non modo in publico sed etiam de publico convivari;* we have *publico* in two senses, but each equally intelligible thru the relation of the word to the rest of the sentence.

The earliest example of *publicum* in the sense of ' a public place,' ' publicity,' is S. C. de Bacchan. *Neve in poplicod neve in preivatod.*

1. NEUTER SINGULAR.

The neuter singular of the adjective is used as a substantive in all cases except the vocative. In the nominative and accusative cases such substantives are used, for the most part, in scientific writings. Nägelsbach attributes this to the evident influence of the Greek mode of expression. So many words of abstract meaning occur in this group, that I feel justified in calling especial attention to them in my classification. Nägelsbach notes among other examples *album, inane* ("vom Lucr. aufgebracht"), *beatum, dilucidum, breve, probabile, illustre, suave, omne, certum, falsum, honestum, verum, magnum.* From this list I would omit *inane.* This is undoubtedly sometimes used in an abstract sense, but I think not in Lucretius. The word will be discussed in full, however, under ellipsis (Class B.) Nägelsbach does not call attention to the fact that the above words express abstract ideas, but Schmalz in his Lateinische Stilistik, p. 434, says, "Durch das Neutrum werden all-

gemein sächliche, zumeist abstrakte Verhältnisse, z. B. *honestum, iustum, immensum,* und in Plural Dinge, die ihrem Wesen nach eine Eigenschaft besonders hervortreten lassen, z. B. *digna, vera,* summa bezeichnet."

In studying the neuter singular as used in Lucretius I have found an abstract meaning in certain substantive adjectives (although various visual or auditory images may have been present in some of the cases cited). A number of other adjectives of this gender and number imply the ellipsis of a substantive. These will be treated under Class B.

(1) I will first cite those examples in which an abstract idea is paramount.

a. Nominative.

2,1043[1]. . . perpende et, si tibi vera videntur,
Dede manus, aut, si *falsum* est, accingere contra.

b. Accusative.

1,615 Praeterea nisi erit *minimum,* parvissima quaeque
Corpora constabunt ex partibus infinitis;
1,959 Namque *extremum* debebat habere; see also 1,752; 960; 964; 4,266.
1,409 Et *verum* protrahere inde; also 4,794; 5,704.
3,525 Ancipitique refutatur convincere *falsum;* also 5,540; 4,764;
3,800 Quippe etenim *mortale* aeterno iungere || Disiperest;
4,477 *dubium;* 4,1119 *malum;* 5,958 *bonum* (also 6,26).

c. Genitive. The genitive case, especially the "partitive" genitive, is often found, according to the grammarians. Nägelsbach cites Cic. Verr. 4,12 *nihil neque privati neque publici neque profani neque sacri.* Other genitives are found even in prose writers, e. g. Cic. De nat. deor. 2,79 *lex, quae est recti praeceptio pravique depulsio.*

[1] The passages quoted from Lucretius in the following pages conform to the text and numbering of Munro's fourth and revised edition, 1896.

In Lucretius I find the partitive genitive in 1,497 *solidi nil;* 3,294 *calidi plus;* 3,915 *Mali hoc;* 5,176 *quidve mali* (also 6,29; 811); 6,663 *Satis mali;* 3,909 *quid sit amari;* 4,1134 *amari aliquit;* 4,474 *Veri nil;* 5,168 *quidve novi;* 5,172 *nil accidit aegri.*

The examples of other genitives than the partitive are: 3,1056 *mali;* 6,1178 *requies mali* (*Mali* adopted by Brix from Macrobius, Sat. 6,2,13); 2,1052 *Veri simile;* 3,646 *mobilitate mali;* 4,476 *notitiam veri falsique* (also 4,479).

For *totius* see translations of Greek expressions, p. 191, below.

Nägelsbach states (p. 101) that the dative case furnished few examples of substantive-adjective usage, chiefly scientific terms. Lucretius furnishes only two datives of this sort: 3,804 . . . . *quid diversius esse putandumst* || *Quam mortale quod est immortali atque perenni* || *Iunctum.*

d. Ablative. The ablative case furnishes comparatively few examples. Nägelsbach cites *recto rectius, bono melius* (Cicero), *aequo et bono* (Sallust). In the following examples of the ablative case the substantive expresses an abstract idea: 1,370 *vero;* 3,313 *aequo;* 3,953 *aequo;* 3,800 *aeterno;* 4,477 *certo* (cited above); 4,557 *aequo.* Perhaps we should place here 1,257 pingui (for MSS. *pinguis*), although it would seem to mean 'fat' rather than 'fatness.'

In this connection mention should be made of *quantum, tantum, tantundem, multum,* common to all authors and periods.

At this point attention should be called to those substantives which have unquestionably been influenced by Greek usage, being translations of Greek expressions. As is well known,[1] "Neuter adjectives and participles are freely em-

[1] Gildersleeve, Syntax of Classical Greek, part I, p. 13, §36.

ployed as substantives in almost any relations, *τὸ παρεληλυθός τὸ μέλλον, τὸ παρόν* Dem. 18,19,2 'the past,' 'the future,' 'the present.'" In *τὸ πᾶν*, 'the whole,' 'the universe,' the substantive character is shown at once by the article. This expression finds an exact counterpart, as far as meaning is concerned, in the *omne* of Lucretius in such phrases as 1,74 *omne immensum pergravit.* In fact, it is highly probable that Lucretius used *omne* as a translation of the *τὸ πᾶν* of Epicurus. In the Epicurea of Usener p. 211, frg. 296 (= Plutarch, Adv. Coloten 13, p. 1114a) *τὸ πᾶν* and *τοῦ παντός* occur. A comparison of the Greek text with Cic. De div. 2,103 will show the close relation existing between the Greek and Latin terms. In the passage cited above *omne* is used to convey the meaning of *τὸ πᾶν* Munro calls Lucretius 1,958ff. *Omne quod est,* etc. almost a translation of Epicurus as given in Diog. 10,41. Here again *τὸ πᾶν* is rendered in Latin by *omne. Omne* is found in the De rerum natura at 1,521; 523; 975; 1024; 958; 967; 987; 2,305; 547; 1049; 4,1620; 5,527; 530; 6,1121. On the analogy of *omne,* or perhaps as an equivalent of the Greek *τὸ πᾶν*, Lucretius also used *totius* in 2,90, *totum* in 5,321.

(2) We pass now to the use of the substantive in prepositional phrases (see Nägelsbach, pp. 102ff.). This use was widespread in Latin literature, Cicero and Livy having used the phrase frequently. These prepositional phrases generally denote relations of place. Sometimes they denote relations of time, while in some instances they metaphorically portray a condition or a situation as a place from which or to which something is taken. In all the phrases found in Lucretius the adjectives seem to have been closely associated with some substantive (subsequently passing out of use in the phrase), excepting in the temporal expression and also, perhaps, in the phrase *per omne.*

Analogous to such a phrase as *per omne* are the metaphorical phrases such as that in Livy 4,43,3 *ex tranquillo,* where there is in all probability no ellipsis. Only three examples are found in Lucretius exemplifying this use: 1,711 Magno opere *a vero* longe derrasse videntur; cf. 1,758 (*a vero*); 1,370 (*a vero*). This metaphorical relation is expressed also in similar prepositional phrases in which there is an ellipsis of a substantive, see pp. 201f.

(3) Nägelsbach (p. 107) states that adjectives of the third declension are not used as substantives to any great extent. Most of the examples given below fall also under other special divisions, but for the sake of uniformity and of adherence to Nägelsbach's classification I give them here also: 4,616 *Habent in se rationis plus operaeve;* also in 1,365; 366; 2,200; 3,1184; 294; 1,521 *Omne foret solidum;* cf. references to *omne* just cited; 3,804 *immortali* atque perenni (cited above); 1,527 *pingui* (cited above); 5,1089 *Quanto mortalis magis aecumst tum potuisse* (also in 3,800, etc.); 1,367 *minus;* 3,382 *aegri* (also in 5,172).

Since *animans,* though originally a participle, is used only as an adjective or substantive, I place it here instead of under the division of participles.

a. Nominative (singular number): 2,573 *corpus enim atque animans erit aer.*

b. Genitive: 3,388 *animantis;* also in 2,938; 3,97; 388; 4,740; 859.

The substantive adjective is accompanied in 3,97; 388; 4,740; 859 by a modifying adjective or pronoun.

c. Accusative:

2,944 Praeterea quamvis *animantem* grandior ictus,
Quam patitur natura, repente adfligit; see also 2,669; 3,666.

d. Ablative: 2,943. In 2,669 and 943 the substantive is modified by an adjectival word.

The comparative and superlative degrees of the adjective used as a substantive may be thus grouped in Lucretius:

plus 1,365; 366; 2,200; 3,294; 4,616; 1184; *minus* 1,367; *extremum quod habent* 1,752; 1,959; 960; 964; 4,266; *minimum* 1,615; 752.

(4) Up to this point I have been treating of the adjective substantive without special reference to words closely associated with it in the sentence. In the examples cited the adjective had taken on the characteristics of the substantive, in other words it had received the rank of a substantive. Nevertheless it had not, so to speak, as yet made use of all a substantive's "rights."[1] This was the next step in the evolution, in consequence of which the adjective is found governing a genitive in the same way in which a substantive does, next a pronoun is found with the substantive and then even another adjective or participle.

Nägelsbach (p. 110) states that the use of the neuter singular with the genitive in Cicero and Caesar is very limited, but is freer in Sallust, Livy and Curtius, such substantivized neuters either expressing something concrete, e. g. *commune,* 'community,' as in Cic. Verr. 2,114, or superlative conceptions like *extremum, ultimum, summum, plurimum.* The usage is almost entirely confined to adjectives of the first and second declensions and to those which like *multum* denote grade, measure and part relations. Therefore most of the genitives are partitives. In Lucretius there are but few examples falling under this head. I have found only:

1,1052 Illud in his rebus longe fuge credere, Memmi,
In medium summae, quod dicunt, omnia niti.

In the superlative: 1,959 *extremum nullius;* 4,266 *extremum saxi;* the genitive with the comparative: 1,365 *plus*

[1] Nägelsbach, p. 109.

inanis; 1,368 *plus in se corporis esse;* 1,367 *vacui minus; plus* and the genitive also occur in 3,294; 5,616.

Only two instances of the adjective used as a substantive modified by a pronoun were found: 3,285; *quiddam unum;* 4,1119 *malum id.* Cf. Wüseke *op. cit.* pp. 8 and 31 for the usage of Plautus and Terence.

I pass now to that use in which the substantive takes an attributive adjective. This usage is common (Nägelsbach, p. 112). Aside from the technical term *summum bonum,* I find also in Lucretius: 1,74 *omne immensum;* 2,1108 *magnum omne;* 5,321 *totum nativum;* 5,958 *commune bonum.*

2. NEUTER PLURAL.

The adjective in the neuter plural is used as a substantive under three conditions:[1] (1) in a definitive sense, (2) expressing an abstract idea, (3) in cases in which there has been an ellipsis of a real substantive. The first two uses I will take up here.

(1) The adjective-substantive used in a strictly definitive sense is found, for the most part, in the nominative and accusative cases. The forms occurring in Lucretius are: *omnia* (*ex omnibus*) 1,61, *et passim; multa* 1,138 etc. etc.; *cetera* (*passim*); *cuncta* (12 cases); *nulla* 1,242; 2,680; *pauca* 2,20.

(2) The abstract adjective substantives have been treated under the neuter singular. The neuter plurals occurring in De rerum natura are:

a. Nominative and Accusative: 1,640 *vera;* 1,700 *vera ac falsa;* 2,1042 *vera;* 4,481 *veris, falsa;* 2,793 *candida;* 2,867 *manufesta;* 3,464 *delira;* 3,734 *mala;* 4,1141

[1] Nägelsbach does not make these divisions.

mala; 3,957 *praesentia;* 4,324 *splendida;* 5,121 *immortalia;* 6,1181 *mira.*

b. Genitive: 3,1020 *terminus malorum;* cf. 5,227 *tantum malorum.*

c. Ablative: 4,481 *veris;* 5,1114 *validis et pulchris;* 6,1085 *plenis.*

The last four examples and 1,172 and 661 *ex omnibus* (*supra cit.*) form a group in which the gender is not recognizable from the ending, but must be determined from the situation (Nägelsbach, p. 116). It must be said, however, that these are not common in the most careful writers. *Repertis* 5,2 (see below) and *intolerabilibusque malis* 6,1158 should also be included in this group.

Some adjective substantives which have a concrete element in their meaning are: 3,2 *inlustrans commoda vitae;* cf. 3,937 *commoda;* 4,1074 *commoda;* 4,504 *manifesta;* 1,732 *praeclara reperta;* 5,2 *hisque repertis*[1]; cf. 5,13; 6,6; 5,320 recipitque *perempta;* 6,1282 *Multaque horrida.*

I give here two instances of the neuter plural comparative used alone: 1,828 *plura;* 6,245 *plura.*

To illustrate the complete evolution of the adjective into the substantive the following examples are given, showing it in combination first with an adjective and then with a pronoun: 1,376 *quamvis omnia sint plena;* 1,1010 *infinita omnia reddat;* 3,734 *mala multa;* 3,937 *omnia commoda;* 3,961 *aliena omnia;* 4,162 *omnia plena* (= 6,269; 1051); 4,403 *omnia tecta* (= 6,575); 4,443 *raraque nubila portant;* 6,134 *ramosa nubila atque aspera;* 5,13 *divina antiqua reperta;* 6,7 *divina reperta;* 5,94 *tria talia texta;* 5,949 *fluenta; lubrica;* 6,527 *cetera omnia;* 731 *nubila omnia;* 1158 (*supra cit.*); 1282 (*supra cit.*). With a pronoun: 3,945 *eadem omnia* (= 3,947); 4, *mala haec.*

[1] Conjecture of Lambinus for MSS. *maiestatis atque repertis.*

3. MASCULINE PLURAL.

Nägelsbach (following Dietrich, op. cit.) states that in the masculine plural only those adjectives can be used as substantives which designate a class of individuals characterized by the quality suggested by the adjective; e. g. Curt. 8,17,4 *militares* = Skr. *çatriyas*.

Wüseke *op. cit.* p. 45f. calls attention to the error of Dietrich and Nägelsbach in supposing that when the masculine and feminine adjective substantives are used in the plural, they necessarily refer to the *whole* class of individuals possessing the quality designated by the adjective. Wüseke distinguishes three uses of these adjectives: (1) they refer to the entire class ("totum genus"); (2) They refer to two or more individuals, either (a) specific, definite individuals (*certae ac definitae personae*) or (b) indefinite (*dubiae atque incertae*); e. g. (1) *illum laudabunt boni* 'die Guten,' Plautus, Bacch. 397; (2) (a) *oues nos uocant pessumae* 'the wenches,' i. e. the two Bacchides, Bacch. 1122.

It is clear that there is nothing in the adjective itself which restricts its application to any one of the three classes, the precise meaning being given by the context, when it exists at all. In the passage cited by Wüseke from Bacch. 397 there is nothing whatever to show that Plautus had in mind the "whole class" of good men, rather than any good men. An author often added *omnes* when he referred to the entire class. It should also be noted that adjectives, after coming to be associated with a class of individuals sharing the quality designated by the adjective, may undergo a shift of meaning, inasmuch as other prominent qualities characteristic of that group may also pass into association with the given substantivized adjective. This is true for example of *optimi*, 'the aristocracy,' which

becoming associated with this distinct political party, naturally connoted in specific instances other traits of the party than those usually implied in the adjective *optimus*. Much depends also upon the previous experiences of the listener. For example *periti militares* (cited by Nägelsbach above) would mean a different thing to one who was already familiar with the Hindu caste system from what it would suggest to one whose only knowledge of it came from this particular passage. The absurdity of the view that only descriptive adjectives can be used substantively is disclosed by the existence of such definitive adjective substantives as *omnes* and *multi*, which I have designedly omitted from the examples cited above, because I considered the classification of Dietrich (cited above by Nägelsbach) too narrow.

The treatment of Nägelsbach takes account only of descriptive adjectives. Various meanings are conveyed by these adjectives and consequently are expressed also in the substantives. Those found in Lucretius I have grouped under three heads: (1) Those that designate nationality, e. g. *Grai, Chaldaei, Teucri, Troiani;* (2) Those that designate relations to other creatures, e. g. *finitimi, similes, mares, consanguinei, minores;* (3) Those that designate a quality of the object: (a) referring to some physical appearance or state, e. g. *squamigeri, arquati, lassi, sani, aegri, animantes, mortales;* (b) referring to some mental characteristic or state: *stolidi, crudeles, stultorum, imbecillorum, indignos, puri, miseri;* (c) referring to some activity: *organici*.

The examples of such substantives used in Lucretius without a modifying adjective or pronoun are:

a. Nominative: 1,641 *omnia enim stolidi magis admirantur amantque*. Other examples are *animantes* 3,749; 1,808; 821; 4,645; 1101; 5,69; 80; *arquati* 4,333; *caecigeni* 2,741; *extorres* 3,50; *Grai* 3,100; 1,831; 2,629;

6,424; *finitimi* 4,581; *magni* 1,741; *mares* 4,1224; *miseri* 5,88; *mortales* 5,348; 6,51; *nati* 3,895; *puri* 4,1026; *organici* 2,412; 5,334; *similes* 4,1211; 1218; *squamigeri* 1,378; *vigiles* 5,1408.

b. Genitive: 2,343 *squamigerum pecudes;* also 2,1083; 3,73 *consanguineum* mensas; 3,1023 *stultorum;* 4,1200 *salientum;* 5,727 *Chaldaeum;* 5,1023 *Imbecillorum esse aecum misererier omnis;* 6,1245 *lassorum vox; Graiorum* 1,136; *Graium veteres docti* 2,600; *Graium poetae* 5,405; 6,754; *maiorum* 4,1226; *gnatorum* 6,13; *animantum* 1,194; 350; 1033; 1038; 2,78; 880; 921; 1063; 1071; 3,266; 720; 5,431; 855; 919.

c. Dative: 1,65 *mortalibus;* also 2,556; 1033; 1158; 3,1074; 1078; 5,15; 1092; 1101; 1165; 6,10; 392; *Teucris* 1,469; *Troianis* 1,476; *stolidis* 1,1068; *humanis* 3,837; *sanis* 4,1075; *miseris* 4,1075; 5,983; *maribus* 4,1198; *immortalibus, beatis* 5,165; *maribus* 5,853; *aegris* 6,1152; *animantibus* 2,256; 914, 3,417; 4,677; 6,773; 984.

d. Accusative: 2,171 . . . . *mortalis;* also 2,625; 3,778; 983; 5,1089; 1280; *Graios* 1,640; *merentes* 2,1104; *humanos* 3,80; [*organices*] 3,132; *vivos* 4,38; *quietos* 5,168; *agrestis* 5,1383.

e. Ablative: 2,919 *mortalibus;* also 5,205; *gnatis* 4,1256.

Examples of definitive adjectives from Lucretius are: *Omnes* 2,1029; 3,582; 1043; 4,708; 1049; 5,1023; *omnibus;* 1,19; 2,836; 1,338; 3,971; 4,564; 708; 5,233; *multi* 4,1015; 1018; 1020; 5,1158; 6,1174; multos 2,277; *multorum* 3,475.

The masculine (and feminine) plural, like the neuter singular and plural of substantive adjective, are not infrequently modified by participles or adjectives; these are usually numeral attributes. See Nägelsbach, pp. 121f. Aside from such adjectives (e. g. *duo, omnes, multi, ceteri, pauci,*

plurimi) Wüseke pp. 49f. finds in Plautus and Terence only *sontis reos* Capt. 476, and *inprobis vanidicis,* Trin. 273, the exact interpretation of both of which passages is doubtful. Lucretius shows a circumscribed, though somewhat wider, range of usage, as can be seen from the following examples:

With adjectives: 1,151 *mortalis omnis;* 1,172 *squamigeris nitentibus;* 2,980 *totis mortalibus;* 4,1234 *gnatis dulcibus;* 5,944 *miseris mortalibus* (also 5,983); 6,1 *mortalibus aegris. With pronouns:* 6,1197 *minoribu' nostris;* 6,1239 *suos ad aegros;* 6,1283 *suos consanguineos.*

4. MASCULINE SINGULAR.

Lucretius used the masculine singular adjective as a substantive very sparingly. Of those classes mentioned by Nägelsbach examples may be cited as follows:

1. Where the substantive has a collective meaning:

3,933 *Quid tibi tanto operest, mortalis, quod nimis aegris Luctibus indulges?* 4,1184 *mortali;* 3,775 *immortali.*

2. Where the thought is directed to a single individual of a group, in which case one is opposed to the other or to others:

5,1050 *Cogere item pluris unus . . . . non poterat.*

3. Where the substantive designates an ideally conceived person:

3,206 *Quae tibi cognita res in multis, ō bone, rebus;* cf. 3,939 *stulte.*

The fourth and fifth classes of Nägelsbach, namely the substantivized adjective (4) in co-ordination with real substantives, and (5) with the indefinite pronouns, do not seem to have been employed by Lucretius. There are, however, three more examples which belong in this general class, but which do not naturally fall under any of the above headings: 3,10 *aegri,* 3,971 *nulli;* 5,173 *tali.*

5. FEMININE.

The feminine of the adjective is comparatively little used as a substantive in Latin. Neither Dietrich, Draeger nor Nägelsbach honor this gender with a separate classification. Its infrequency is, of course, due to the fact that outside of a few writers the bulk of Latin literature is of such a character that words expressing the qualities of women would not naturally enter into it. If any proof of this were needed it would be afforded by the following list of substantive adjectives cited by Wüseke from Plautus and Terence (the singular appears to be used somewhat *more frequently* than the plural): *alia* (11 cases), *bella, barda, bona* (3 cases), *ceterae, ignava, indocta, inepta, ingenua* (2), *inmemori, inproba* (2), *inp(r)udens, inopem, insipiens* (2), *insana* (2), *lepida* (2), *lepidissuma, lauta* (2) *libera, liberalis, mea* (8), *multae, mala* (5), [*misera*], *nulla* (2), *neutram, nota, omnes* (2), *optuma, orba, paucae, pauper, peregrina, perita, pessuma* (5), *proba, pudica, sua scelesta* (2), *sicca,* [*sucida*], *stulta, tua* (3), *timida* (2), *trivenefica, turpes, nostra* (2), *ulla, utraque* (2), *utravis, uuida.*

In Lucretius 4, 1151-1174 occur twenty-three such adjective substantives: *multae, pravas, turpis, nigra, immunda, fetida, caesia, nervosa, lignea, parvula, tota* (?), *magna, immanis, balba, muta, flagrans, odiosa, loquacula,* [*tumida*], *mammosa, simula, labeosa, turpi,* (compare the very similar passage in Horace, Serm. 1,3,43). Aside from these and the substantives classed in group B there occur *diva* and *incluta* (1,40-42), in which passage *incluta* may have adjectival force.

With the exception of *muta* I find none of the above mentioned substantives used as proper names. *Muta* was a goddess, called also *Lara* or *Tacita,* whom Jupiter on account of her talkativeness struck dumb, Cf. Ov. Fasti. 2,583.

6. PARTICIPLES.

Participles are used as substantives by Lucretius, as by other authors, and as such exhibit all the uses and appear in all the relations of other adjectives used as substantives.

(1) *Neuter (singular and plural):* The neuter singular used as a substantive occurs from the earliest literature on (see Wüseke, p. 31; Nägelsbach, p. 131), but I have found no instance of its use in Lucretius. In the neuter plural, however, there are several of the perfect participle.[1]

Nominative: Munita viai 3,498; *saxorum structa* 4,361; *bene parta patrum* 6,1129; *tecta* 4,549; 575. *Dative* or *ablative: dictis* 1,28; 103; 126; 143; 267; 333; 401; 418; 2,66; 987; 3,178; 902; 4,175; 592; 837; 5,50; 54; 56; 99; 104; 113; 6,24; 42; *factis* 1,296; 3,897. *Accusative:* 1,136 *Graiorum obscura reperta; reperta* 1,732; aliorum *antiqua reperta* 5,13; *divina reperta* 6,7; *dicta* 2,730; 3,12; 135; 4,461; 880; 914; 5,53; *abdita* 6,809; *clausa* 1,354; *deserta* 1,164; 2,1102; *culta* 1,164; *prompta* 6,817; *Strata* 4,415; *structa* 4,361; *tecta* 2,91; 1110; 4,403; 430; 517; 5,984; 6,223; 261; 597; 1262; *texta* 4,743; 5,94; 6,997; 1054.

(2) *Masculine Plural.*

In the plural of the present active participle all cases are freely used as substantives, even the nominative and accusative.

(a) *Nominative and accusative: medentes* 1,936; *reges rerumque potentis* 2,50; 3,1027; *saltantis* 4,980. (b) *Genitive:* 1,318 dextras *salutantum praeterque meantum; amantum* 4,1077; 5,962; *canentum* 4,585; 5,1385; *carentum* 4,35; *salientum* 4,1200; *venantum* 4,991. (c) *Dative: nascentibus* 1,113; 3,671; *opinantibus* 5,1320; *spirantibus* 4,937; *venientibus* 5,1319; *vigilantibus* 5,1405.

[1] Fluenta (5,949) is an obscure formation.

(d) *Accusative: nocentes* 2,1103; *merentes* 2,1104; *moventis* 4,980; *saltantis* 4,980; *progredientis* 5,1453.

The perfect passive participle in Lucretius yields two examples both in the accusative case (*armatum* 5,1297; 1301).

The present active participle is used more than any other as a substantive in Latin. As stated above, however, this use is rare in the nominative and Nägelsbach even goes so far as to say that it is never so used in the classical writers, there being nothing, to hinder the participle referring to the preceding subject, and holds that Seneca was first to use it as a substantive employing it, e. g. in De Ira 1,4,1. Terence, Phormio 243 had already written *Pericla, damna, exilia peregre rediens semper secum cogitet.* Wüseke, p. 44, cites also *Amans* from Plaut. Pseud. 238; Truc. 26; 56; *intellegens* Eun. 232. There are at least two examples of the nominative in Lucretius:

4,1024 Flumen item *sitiens* aut fontem propter amoenum
adsidet;
4,1097 Ut bibere in somnis *sitiens* quom quaerit.

In Cicero the ablative is not often used but the other cases are frequently. Other examples from Lucretius are: *eunti* 3,524; *cubanti* 4,952; *opinanti* 3,959.

Lucretius affords no examples of the future participle with substantive force, since *flexura* (4,312), *iunctura* (4,1083), etc. are substantives belonging to the class *natura, cultura, scriptura,* etc. formed with the suffix *-tew-rā, -seu-rā* (cf. Hist. Gram. vol. 1 (Stolz), pp. 557f.).

CLASS B.

In this group the change in the meaning of the adjective is largely due not to any morphological elements in the word itself, but to the influence of a substantive which was subsequently omitted. On the nature of this change see

above pp. 182ff. In some words the transfer of the meaning has been so completely effected that the substantive usage alone remains, the former adjective usage having become obsolete. *Apropos* the ellipsis involved in this usage, Ott (*op. cit.* pp. 2f.) says: "Um die Sache an Beispielen klar zu machen, so steht es für mich fest, dass Substantive wie *aerarium, apiarium, doliarium, farinarium, farrarium, frigidarium,* (*Kaltkammer*), *granarium, mellarium, olearium, palearium, plumbarium, pomarium* (Obstkammer), u. a. die Ellipse von *horreum* zu Grunde liegt, wenn ich auch nicht im Stande bin, ihre einstige Verbindung mit diesem Genusnamen nachzuweisen." 'Apropos of this statement three remarks may be made. First we should hesitate to trust our "feeling" (implied in "es steht für mich fest") in dealing with any language except our own vernacular. Secondly the assumption of *horreum* may be too arbitrary. With *aerarium* for example, *aedificium* or something similar is more natural. Thirdly we must not overlook the fact that the suffix *-arium* was a productive suffix widely used to make substantives of this general character, even when a corresponding adjective ending in *-arius* did not exist.'

When is an adjective to be regarded as a true substantive? On this point Paul (*op. cit.* p. 298) says, "Sobald nun die Unterstützung durch die Situation für das Verständniss entbehrlich ist, so ist auch das Wort nicht mehr als ein Adjectiv zu betrachten, sondern als ein wirkliches Substantivum, und es kann dann von einer Ellipse in keinem Sinne mehr die Rede sein." To this Professor Rolfe[1] adds very aptly, that even after an adjective has become a genuine substantive the original combination of adjective plus substantive may nevertheless be used on stylistic or euphonic grounds just as in English we speak now of 'the Atlantic,'

[1] Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc. vol. 31, p. 7.

now of 'the Atlantic Ocean.' Other instances which I might mention are 'to explore the Yellowstone' or 'to explore the Yellowstone Park,' 'to ride on the Mississippi' or 'to ride on the Mississippi River,' yet in such cases we must also raise the question as to whether in the fuller expressions 'Atlantic Ocean,' 'Yellowstone Park' and the like a consciousness of the attributive character of the Atlantic, Yellowstone etc. is present or whether the words have so far coalesced as to form a single concept and thus become compound proper nouns, as for example 'Lake Michigan.' To the Latinist the determination of such a question becomes, of course extremely difficult in most cases, if not impossible. Thus in Lactantius, Inst. 5,1,24 is found *ex artis oratoriae professione* although the word *oratoria* is used as a substantive by Quintil. 2,14,1 and even by Lactantius himself in Inst. 3,25,11 *ne oratoria quidem ignoranda est.*[1] In this connection attention should be called to the need of extraordinary caution in respect to the so-called ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction, that is, when the substantive with reference to which the meaning of the so-called substantive adjective is chiefly determined, is found not in the connection with such an adjective but in the more or less remote context. ,This case is clearly a special type of the general situation which Paul (p. 297) describes as "Ergänzung aus der Situation."' These cases must, of course, be carefully distinguished and excluded. Ἀπὸ κοινοῦ is also found in passages in which there is a general subject and words are used referring to the general subject at various places in the passage. In Pliny's Natural History whole chapters are devoted to special subjects, and when such a reference is made, the generic notion is suggested by the general subject of the chapter. It is very difficult and

[1] Cf. also Tac. Dial. 6,1 and 8,14 *oratoria eloquentia.*

naturally it is often impossible to decide whether one has a case of true ellipsis or only the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction.

A very remarkable instance of this is found in Lucretius 2,442-463. Beginning with line 60 the atoms have been under discussion. ,In lines 442-463 the expressions *hamatis, ramosis, levibus, rotundis* and *perplexis* occur as designations of atoms. The fact that Lucretius in the course of book 2 uses a variety of general terms to designate his atoms (e. g. *genitalia corpora* (l. 63), *exordia rerum* (l. 333), primordia (ll. 379, 396), elementa (ll. 393, 411, 414), principia (l. 443), and uses in fact the last two at the beginning and at the close of this passage, would suggest that the poet had in mind throughout this passage no one particular word, with reference to which the underscored words were used, but rather the picture or concept of the objects themselves.'

I have divided these adjective substantives into three classes. In the first are included "true substantives" employed without consciousness of ellipsis. The second and much larger class consists of adjectives substantivized in connection with an elided noun, yet sometimes used as a true adjective. This class is well illustrated by the word *fera* with bestia (?) omitted. This substantive has by long and popular use taken on all but exclusively the function of a substantive, yet we find in Cic. Lael. 21 *Hoc apparet in bestiis, volucribus, nantibus, agrestibus, cicurribus, feris,* the word *feris* has an adjectival force.

The third division is that in which the omitted substantive is made evident only through the situation, i. e. the connection of the adjective used as a substantive with that particular portion of the context. A very good example is that of Lucretius 4,723 *et unde quae veniunt veniant in mentem, percipe paucis.* Here the omitted substantive is

plainly *verbis* yet nothing in the adjective itself shows this. It is, rather the whole situation which determines the omitted word. The word "positional" is used to describe this class.

GROUP 1. TRUE SUBSTANTIVES.

Only one example of the first group is found in Lucretius and that is derived from a geographical proper adjective.

> 3,382 **nam neque pulveris interdum sentimus adhaesum corpore nec membris incussam sidere *cretam***

Lucretius here uses *creta* 'chalk' for *creta terra.*

Professor Rolfe[1] says of this word; "The original meaning of *creta* was so completely lost sight of that Pliny, Nat. hist. 33,163 speaks of *cretam Eretriam* exactly as we do of 'Dresden china'—The word appears as a substantive in the earliest Latin, e. g. Plaut. Aul. 709. The word seems not to occur in Greek, but Diosc. 5,171 has Ἐρετριής (sc. γῆ). Plin. Nat. hist. 35,196 mentions *Cimolia (Sarda, Umbrica, Thessalica)*, etc." The complete obliteration of the original idea in this adjective plus substantive is shown very clearly in Horace, Odes 1,36,10 *Cressa ne careat pulchra dies nota.* "The meaning is, 'that the day may be a bright one in our memory,' from the practice of recording especially happy days with a white mark and unhappy ones with black";[2] cf. Serm. 2,3,246 *Sani ut creta, an carbone notanti?*

A word which comes very near this category is *serpens,* probably originally used with *bestia,* yet it is occasionally used as an adjective.

The examples of *serpens* in Lucretius are: 3,658 *micanti serpentis cauda;* 4,60 *lubrica serpens;* 4,638 *serpens ipsa.*

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 8.
[2] Smith, *ad loc.*

Plautus has *proserpens bestia* in four instances: Asin. 695; Pers. 299; Stich. 722; Poen. 1034. *Bestia* is probably to be supplied with the examples given from Lucretius, although *serpens* is also used as a masculine in 5,38 where it refers to the dragon of the Hesperides, and it is used by other authors in the masculine as an appellative (see Virgil, Aen. 5,273). In such case perhaps *draco* is the omitted substantive (cf. Suetonius, Tiber 72 *erat ei in delectamentis serpens draco.*

An adjective-substantive very freely used by Lucretius is *inane* with which I think *spatium* was originally used. That Lucretius himself felt the substantive is plainly evident from the examples 1,527 *Quae spatium pleno possint distinguere inane;* cf. 1,523. There is no instance in Lucretius of the use of *inane* in the purely abstract sense where the supplying of *spatium* would give an incorrect meaning to the passage. The instances of *inane* are so numerous that I cite them by figures only:

(a) *Nominative:* 1,330; 420; 342; 480; 509; 511; 569; 954; 1010; 1079; 2,236; 5,357; 365; 366. (b) *Accusative:* 1,369; 382; 386; 399; 426; 439; 507; 514; 517; 520; 536; 655; 658; 745; 843; 1074. (c) *Genitive:* 1,365 *plus inanis,* which shows an adjective-substantive of the third declension used with another of the same declension, a very rare use, according to Nägelsbach. (d) *Ablative:* 1,526; 660; (*v. 1. inane*); 1,742; 1009; (*v. 1. inane*); 6,941. For *inane* in prepositional phrases cf. pp. 210, 211.

A word closely allied to *inane* is the technical term *vacuum.* This also became a substantive through the ellipsis of *spatium* and the same phenomena are evident in the transformation. In a few places it retains its adjectival force as in 1,523. I give the examples from Lucretius according to case and use in the sentence.

Nominative: 1,393; 394. *Genitive:* 1,367 *vacui minus. Accusative:* in prepositional phrases: *in vacuum* 6,1007; 1014; 1017.

GROUP 2. "QUASI-SUBSTANTIVES."

The second division, intermediate between the extremes, includes those in which the omitted word is *almost* certainly known without the context. For all practical purposes these substantives, like the preceding, are true substantives, but as they are slightly over the boundary line I have thought best to make a separate division for them. Examples in point are our own words "right" and "left," Latin *dextera* and *laeva.* With these two words *manus* is omitted, but they belong to the quasi-substantives because even without the context, the whole idea is conveyed with fairly reasonable certainty. To be sure *laeva* and *dextra* might, in an adjectival sense refer to something other than *manus,* but in the ordinary usage the adjective plus the substantive idea is expressed with reasonable clearness by *laeva* and *dextra* alone. Examples: 3,649; 651; 5,1298.

A substantive as frequently used by Lucretius as any other is *fera* with which *bestia* was originally used (cf. Cic. Lael. 21 cited above).

The examples of *fera* in Lucretius are: *Nominative:* 2,343 *armenta feraeque;* 2,922; 3,880; 4,1197; 5,228. *Genitive:* 1,404 montivagae ferai; 163 genus omne *ferarum;* also 1,255; 2,539; 597; 598; 877; 995; 1076; 1081; 1152; 3,753; 776; 872; 888; 4,413; 680; 686; 994; 1264; 5,39; 201; 218; 932; 947; 967; 1059; 1338; 6,198; 766. *Dative:* 5,991; *Accusative:* 2,604; 5,868.

Words of this same type are *volucer, ales, quadrupes.* With *quadrupes* I supply *bestia* or *belua* (cf. however, in Vergil *quadrupedante* used for horse); with *ales, avis* or *bestia;* with *volucer, ales, avis* or *bestia.* The examples in

Lucretius are: 2,928 *alituum;* (also 5,801; 1039; 1078; [6,818;] 821); 1,12 aeriae *volucres;* (also 1,162; 589; 2,145; 344; 3,880; 984; 993; 4,1007; 1197; 5,801; 825; 1078); 2,536 quadripedum in genere; also 4,1265; 5,1202; 6,757.

An adjective-substantive made by the ellipsis of a noun, and frequently met in Lucretius, is *summa.* The word to be supplied here is, in my opinion, *ratio* (cf. Cic. De leg. 1,18 *lex est ratio summa, insita in natura, quae iubet ea, quae facienda sunt, prohibetque, contraria;* Ad Att. 8,11. D §5; and Lucretius 1,54 *de summa caeli ratione.*

Summa is often used by Lucretius in a technical sense. I give first the examples in which this word is used alone; second those in which another substantive modifies it; and third, those in which it is limited by an adjective either attributive or predicative.

Summa alone. Nominative: 1,1045; 2,310; 5,194; 330; 6,606. *Genitive:* 1,953; *summae finis;* 1,1053 *in medium summae. Accusative:* 1,436; 636; 706; 963; 1042; 2,513; 518; 527; 530; 5,368. *Ablative:* 2,1054; 1077; 3,84; 514; 2,91 *in summa.*

Summa with a modifying genitive: Rerum summa: 1,756; 1008; 1028; 2,75; 5,237; 2,303; 649; 1,333. *Summa loci:* 2,1044. *Summa salutis:* 2,863. *Summarum summa:* 5,361. The last example is particularly interesting. *Immensi summam:* 2,1095; 6,485. *Summam materiai:* 2,527. *Ad maris s.* 6,613.

Summa with a modifying adjective: Summae totius 1,988; *incolumis summa* 2,71; *S. ulla* 2,339; *ad summam summai totius omnem* 6,679 (cf. *summarum s.* above).

GROUP 3. POSITIONAL SUBSTANTIVES.

In this group the omitted substantive can be determined only by the situation, the environment of the substantive in

question. This class may be still further subdivided into (a) substantives which do not, in themselves, give a hint of the omitted word, and (b) those which barely suggest the elided substantive, but do not afford sufficient evidence to determine it with certainty.

Subdivision (a).

> 5,905 Qui fieri potuit, triplici cum corpore ut una,
> *Prima* leo, *postrema* draco, *media* ipsa, chimaera
> Ore foras acrem flaret de corpore flammam?

Here the omitted substantive is plainly *pars*, but in other situations *prima, postrema* and *media* might refer to other objects or might have their adjectival force.

3,522 *medicina.* On this word see Rolfe, Archiv. Lat. Lex. vol. 10 (1898), p. 235, who supplies *ars* rather than *res;* and compare C. I. L. VIII, 241 *medica arte* and Varro, De ling. lat. 1,593 *ab arte medicina medicus dictus.*

The usage *magni referre* 2,894 seems to be based on such expressions as *parvi pretii, magni* (*pretii*) *aestimare,* which are quite common. Other examples in Lucretius are 1,817; 2,883; 894; 4,984; 1257; 1264; 5,545; always with *referre;* 1,908 *permagni referre.*

With *pleraque* in 1,1215-22 the omitted substantive *animalia* becomes evident only when we take the word *pleraque* in its environment; and even here it is quite unlikely that Lucretius had any verbal image of the word *animalia* in his mind.

Expressions denoting relations (chiefly local) are mostly prepositional phrases with the neuter singular adjective substantive in the ablative or accusative case. Lucretius follows the general Latin usage. He uses *ad* (*in*) *imum, ab* (*ex*) *imo, in* (*per*) *medium, in* (*a*) *medio, in artum, ab* (*e*) *summo, ex* (*de*) *supero, in aperto, per inane, in inani, in arto.* If there has been any ellipsis here, it was

doubtless of *locum, loco,* though with *inane* the word *spatium* should rather be thought of. It is possible, however, that all these cases fall under class A above (p. 192).

An interesting example is found in 6,62: *Rursus in antiquas referuntur religionis.*

The metaphorical meaning of the phrase becomes clear only when we have the context. I would supply here *sententias,* the idea being of persons borne back into their old superstitions.

Expressions like *abrupta, ardua, summa* are said (Draeger, *op. cit.* vol. 1, p. 50) to be due to the ellipsis of the word *loca.* If this view is correct the Lucretian representatives should find mention at this point. Unquestionably adjectives like the above occur as modifiers of *loca,* e. g. Liv. 39,1,5 *ardua atque iniqua loca,* Caes. Bell. Gall. 2,19,5 *loca aperta,* but that the substantive use of these *pluralia neutra* developed out of the combination of adjective plus *loca* is not thereby proven. They may have developed like the adjective substantives in class A. Lucretius has the following examples: *culta ac deserta* 1,164; *ultima naturae* 1,1116; *summa atque ima* 2,488; and the prepositional phrases: 1,223 *per inania;* 2,1102 *in deserta recedens;* 6,142 *per nubila* (also 6,199); 4,74 *de summis;* 2,892 *ex omnibus.* In the last two cases the endings give no indication as to gender and we have to depend on the situation for the exact meaning.

The examples of the substantive with a genitive to complete its meaning (see Nägelsbach, p. 114): 1,354 *clausa domorum;* 4,612 *clausa* [domorum]; 5,417 *pontique profunda;* 5,1374 *olearum caerula;* 6,96 *caerula caeli;* 6,214 *nubila caeli* (also 1,6; 278); 1,659 *Ardua dum metuunt amittunt vera viai* || MSS. *ver. aula* ||. In prepositional phrases: 1,340 *per . . . . sublimaque caeli;* 1,1090 *per*

caeli caerula; 2,115 *per opaca domorum;* 4,730 *corporis . . . . per rara;* 5,771 *per caerula mundi;* 6,332 *per rara viarum;* 6,817 *in apertum promptaque caeli.*

The adjective-substantive modified by an attributive adjective or participle: 4,101 *simili specie praedita rerum extima* || MSS. *ex* ||; 6,269 *ventis atque ignibus omnia plena sunt;* 6,462 *nubila tenuia;* 6,731 *nubila omnia.*

To the above list of positional substantives we may append the following, which only provisionally reveal the omitted word through their inherent meaning: 2,369ff. *Praeterea teneri tremulis cum vocibus haedi cornigeras norunt matres agnique petulci balantum pecudes.* If a substantive has been elided in connection with the substantive use of *balantes,* we should naturally think of *oves* (cf. Phaedrus 3,15,1 *agno balanti*) while *avis* or *ales* is suggested by 2,878 *pennipotentum* (cf. 4,1010 *persectantes volantes*).

With the expression *ex infinito,* while the idea of infinity is very evident, whether this infinity is of time or space can only be ascertained by a study of the connection of the phrase in its environment. The time element is in the ascendency in
2,255 *Ex infinite* (sc. *tempore*) *ne causam causa sequatur;* cf. 1,1025; 2,530. Lucretius also uses the full form of the expression, e. g. 2,574 *ex infinito tempore;* also in 1,550; 578; 5,188; 316; 378; 423.

On the other hand the spacial conception occurs with *infinito* in: 5,408; 1,1001; 1036; 5,367; 414.

With *salso* I supply *aequore* in 5,1080 in *salso* || *salsis* Lamb. ||, on the basis of those passages in which Lucretius himself has used the fuller forms of expression; for example 3,493; 5,128; 6,634 all three of which show the expression *aequore salso.*

Lucretius uses a few substantives in the neuter plural which have been formed from geographical names. For full discussion of such formation see Professor Rolfe's "The Formation of Latin Substantives from Geographical Adjectives by Ellipsis," already referred to.

In each of the instances given below the word to be supplied is ascertained by the historical associations connected with the word itself and also by the situation in the text. For instance, we know that the Babylonians were famed for their textiles and that the Sicyonians were celebrated for the taste and skill displayed in the various articles of dress made by them, among which we find mention of a certain kind of shoe much prized in all parts of Greece. Cicero refers to such foot-wear in De oratore 1,231 with the words *calceos Sicyonios*. The passages in Lucretius are:

4,1125 Huic lenta et pulchra in pedibus *Sicyonia* rident.
4,1029 Interdum in pallam atque *Alidensia Ciaque* vertunt;
Cum *Babylonica* (i. e. "coverlets") magnifico splendore rigantur;
4,1123 Labitur interea res et *Babylonica* fiunt.

ALPHABETICAL LIST.

abdita (loca), Alidensia Ciaque (texta), altum (caelum, mare, locum), ales (avis, bestia), amaracinum (unguentum), angustum (locum), antiquas (sententias), ardua (loca), apertum (locum, caelum), artum (locum). Babylonica (texta), balantum (ovium). Caerula (loca), cava (loca), Cia cf. Alidensia, clausa (loca), creta (terra), culta (loca). Deserta (loca), dextra (manus), [Extima] (loca). Fera (bestia). Infinitum (tempus, spatium), inane (spatium), inania (loca), ima (loca). Laeva (manus). Magni (pretii?), media (pars), medium (locum), medicina

(ars), multa (verba). Nubila (loca). Omnia (loca), omnibus (elementis), opaca (loca). Parvum (argentum), parvus (puer), paucum (verbum), penni potens (ales, avis, bestia), persectans cf. pennipotens, planum (locum), pleraque (animalia), pluribus (verbis), postrema (pars), prima (pars), profunda (loca), profundi (spatii?), prompta (loca). Quadrupes (bestia), quantum (pondus, spatium). Rara (loca). Salientum (marum), salsum (aequor), serena (loca), serpens (bestia, draco), Sicyonia (calciamenta), sublima (loca), summa (loca), summa (ratio), superum (locum). Tantum (pondus, spatium). Ultima (loca), unum (locum). Vacans (spatium), vacuum (spatium), vera (loca), volans (ales, avis, bestia), volucer (ales, bestia).

SUMMARY.

1. Lucretius did not use a neuter singular of the participle as a substantive, a use noted in other writers.

2. He did not use the adjective as a substantive near or in the midst of real substantives or with indefinite pronouns.

3. He used the nominative singular masculine present participle as a substantive, a use denied by Nägelsbach.

4. He made sufficiently extensive use, at least in one section, of feminine adjective substantives to necessitate a special classification of them.

5. His use of the future participle was limited.

AUTOBIOGRAPHIC ELEMENTS IN LATIN INSCRIPTIONS

In the Roman literature a tendency to the personal narrative of events closely connected with the writer's own experience and personal comment on such events is predominant. So the Roman epic poetry deals largely with contemporary history or happenings not too remote; even in the Aeneid, where the scene is laid in the heroic past, the personages of Virgil's own day, as Marcellus, are introduced. This tendency is still more clearly seen in the literary types the Romans themselves originated. Satire is a characteristic Roman product: but satire is merely a criticism which the author's personality passes on its environment. And the Romans also created the literary form that aims at a complete disclosure of the writer's life and personality, the autobiography, with which the subject under discussion is immediately connected.[1]

It is not surprising then that the inscriptions also reveal in a marked degree the same personal tendency. Strangely enough, with one recent exception,[2] this has scarcely been recognized: hence it does not seem useless here to indicate the extent to which the highest development of this feeling (which we may perhaps call the "autobiographic feeling") enters into Latin inscriptions, and the various forms it assumes.

We must first notice, however, that these inscriptions, as compared with the Roman literary autobiography, have two

NOTE.—The references indicated by the superior figures numbered consecutively 1-131 are found in Appendix A.

limitations. First, though they present far more autobiographic expressions than those of other ancient languages, they are not the earliest of an autobiographic nature. In Greece we have a number of epigrams in the first person dating from the sixth to the third century. B. C.;[a] and the records of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings go back of that some fifteen hundred years.

Again, inscriptions are relatively short, and the autobiographic statements are thus restricted. For this reason one cannot properly speak of "autobiographies" except in connection with the Monumentum Ancyranum and a few other of the longer inscriptions in prose and verse: the rest furnish simply "autobiographic elements."

By the term "autobiographic element" we mean that throughout an entire inscription, or in some part of it, an interested person gives us personal information concerning his own life and character, either by stating facts about his life, or by expressing an opinion regarding events that have happened or he wishes may happen to him, or by placing himself in relation to another person to whom the reader's attention is chiefly directed. For the first two of these three ways of expressing autobiographic feeling the first person of the verb and the first person pronoun are used; for the third, where this feeling is much weaker, we have the possessives *meus* and *noster*. This feeling may be still less prominent, being simply implied in the second person of address; and we may conceive of inscriptions where it is cleverly hidden by the use of the third person, as in Caesar's Commentaries. However, this paper deals only with inscriptions where the autobiographic feeling is so marked that the first person is employed.

But several classes of inscriptions containing a first person are not truly autobiographic. First, chance scribblings which tell us nothing about a definite person need not be

taken into account. These may be: 1) fragments of a few words, as C. I. L. IV, 1927, *tu enim me doces;* 2) salutations, wishes and prayers, as C. I. L. IV, 2059; *Ianuarias nobis felices multis annis;* 3) mere general statements, often proverbial in character, as C. I. L. IV, 346, ll. 2-4, *alter amat, alter | amatur; ego fastidi, | qui fastidit amat.* Of these the *graffiti* of Pompeii give us the most examples; but similar rough scratchings on the living rock or on tiles are found in many other parts of the Roman world.[4]

Such phrases and sentences are often stereotyped, as the *oro vos, faciatis* of Pompeian election notices; and in such forms they appear also on a large variety of every-day objects. Variations of one phrase, *annum novum faustum felicem mihi,* are common on lamps of the first century;[5] like wishes and prayers for the prosperity of one's self and others occur on a variety of pagan and Christian objects, as late as the sixth century.[6] A gaming board invites one to play (C. I. L. VIII, 21084), drinking-vessels bid one fill the cup;[7] the latter also sometimes bear protestations of love,[8] which are frequent enough on gems and jewelry, especially engagement rings.[9] Pagan and Christian paintings and mosaics often have inscriptions connected with the subjects portrayed;[10] Christian mosaics may also contain quotations from the Scriptures.[11] Apart from these Biblical quotations, we have only one certain quotation of a proverbial character, that is, Virgil, Eclogue 10, 69, *omnia vincit amor; et nos cedamus amori,* on a silver spoon from Lampsacus (C. I. L. III, 12274 b).[12]

Occasionally similar phrases and sentences are found in formal inscriptions on stone. Of the pagan examples but few are in prose, as C. I. L. VI, 29954, *sol me rapuit,* III, 3881, *utamur felices,* XII, 2366, l. 6, *omines mortales sumus* (cf. also XII, 4315, 4524); the rest, mainly from Rome, are metrical and proverbial, like C. I. L. V, 6693 (Büch.

610), l. 5, *omnes mortales; eadem nam sorte tenemur.*[13] The Christian examples are chiefly confined to the cities of Rome and Ravenna and the portion of northern Africa between ancient Sitifis and Lambaesis. Many of them are mottoes (e. g., C. I. L. VIII, 2215, *spes in me*),[14] or quotations of Scriptural texts.[15] The latter, like the texts on the mosaics just mentioned (p. 217), often vary from the Latin versions of Jerome; they may thus preserve the older versions, especially in Africa, where the oldest Latin translations of the Bible arose and where they longest persisted (see Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, pp. 3452-3466). The rest are indefinite expressions of wishes or opinions in the first person plural, usually incorporated in dedications to dead ecclesiastics or saints; a good instance is C. I. L. XI, 302 a, from Ravenna, *domnus Neon episcopus senescat nobis.*[16]

Second, the possessive *noster* frequently refers, not to several distinct individuals, but to some group of individuals as a whole, and so does not form an autobiographic element in an inscription. The best instances of this are phrases like *patria nostra, civitas nostra, ordo noster, patronus noster, pater noster* (a bishop) and *nomen nostrum* in various decrees and offerings of towns, boards of municipal officers, *collegia,* churches and other "juristic persons." These inscriptions cover a long period, from the *senatus noster* of the Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus (C. I. L. I, 196 = X, 104, 186 B. C.) to the *monasterio nostro* of a Christian inscription of the sixth century (C. I. L. XII, 944): but the majority, some 38 out of a possible 50, fall within the period covering the second to the fourth centuries of the Empire.

Another illustration of this use of *noster* is found in the *Lucius noster, Gaius noster,* etc., of the dedications for the health and safety of the person named by members of his

familia or in other inscriptions where the *familia* of the man is concerned. Here the personal and individual application is more prominent, for generally the names of two or more dedicators are expressly given: but as *noster* is used when only one dedicator is mentioned, it is clear that the possessive after all refers to the *familia* as a whole. These phrases are not extensively employed; only at Rome and Nîmes has any number of inscriptions containing them been discovered.[17]

The frequent use of *noster* with Imperial titles [18] is a development from this *noster* with proper names, but presents several features of its own. First, the phrases occur so many thousands of times that by the second century, at least, they have become mere conventional forms; this is especially true of *d(ominus)n(oster)*, which finally occupies a regular position in the inscriptions.[19] Second, the earliest appearance of *noster* with the different titles varies considerably in time. The oldest form on dated inscriptions is *princeps noster,* first noticed in Phrygia just before the Christian era (C. I. L. III, 12240); shortly after this, in 11 A. D., we meet with *Aug. n.* (C. I. L. III, 334, from Bithynia); in Nero's time come *Caesar n.* and *imp. n.* (C. I. L. II, 1281, 57 A. D., III, 30, from Egypt, 65 A. D.). Finally, when under Antoninus Pius the word *dominus,* which denoted the relation of dependence of the *familia* upon the *paterfamilias,* begins to be applied to the Emperor, the *noster* is at once attached to it (e. g., C. I. L. VI, 2120, 155 A. D.). This last title, the prevailing one by the time of Constantine, is adopted by the Eastern Empire, the Gothic kings of Italy and Spain,[20] and the Frankish kings of the sixth and seventh centuries;[21] we meet with it as late as Phocas and Heraclius,[22] on the border of the Middle Ages.[23]

Third, the Imperial documents (orations, decrees, edicts, rescripts, military diplomas and letters) written in the first person are not strictly autobiographic. Of course where these documents are merely quoted, or where in the East the "editorial we" occurs,[24] that is, a nominative plural referring to a single Emperor, the case is clear; for the citation of another man's words is not autobiography, and the use of the plural is simply an expedient to *prevent* the command from seeming too personal. But even where the singular is used, the language is only the officially authorized form, like that of our Thanksgiving Proclamation or the Preamble to the Constitution. If the language of the Roman documents seems more emphatically personal than that of our own, it is because the Emperor as ruler of the world could speak with authority.

The language of many other public documents is similarly of an official nature and not autobiographic. Such are: the letter of the praetor Cornelius to the people of Tibur (C. I. L. XIV, 3584 = I, 201, ca. 159 B. C.); two edicts of *praefecti urbi* containing the "editorial we" (C. I. L. VI, 1711, ca. 488 A. D., 1771, 363 A. D.); official letters of various Imperial officers, which often quote liberally from documents; decrees and dedications of municipal officers and *collegia,* in which it is noteworthy that, except in X, 5200, of the fourth century, *censuerunt* or *cens.* is always employed, regardless of the other first persons; and two decrees of private persons acting officially (C. I. L. V, 7749 = I, 199, 117 B. C., X, 7852, 69 A. D.). Special mention must be made of the records of the Arval Brothers and the Secular Games, which give copious quotations both from decrees and from prayers (C. I. L. VI, 2024, etc., 32350, etc.; 877, 32323, 32325-9); closely allied to them are the known examples of *leges arae* (C. I. L. III, 1933, 137 A. D.,

XII, 1549, end 2d century, 4333, 11 A. D.), and oaths of allegiance to Caligula (C. I. L. II, 172, XI, 5998). Finally, private documents, particularly wills, are often cited on sepulchral inscriptions; the fact that the passage is quoted is usually indicated by a heading[25] (cf. p. 246).

Fourth, in a few inscriptions, mostly metrical, some genuine personal utterance is definitely quoted. The contents of these quotations differ widely. There are reflections on life, complaints, consolatory remarks by the dead, addresses to wayfarers, a prayer to God; as C. I. L. XIII, 8655 (Büch. 1006),

> **Vos rogitat, quaeso, soror unica fratris amantis,**
> **ni dissigilletis nive violetis opus;**

and C. I. L. XIV, 1938 (Büch. 681), '*Accipe me*' *dixit* '*domin*[*e in tua limina Christe*']:[26] even God himself is represented as giving Peter authority over the Church (Bull. Crist. Second Series, vol. 2 (1871), p. 117, ca. 419 A. D.)

Lastly, there are a number of personifications, in which inanimate objects speak in the first person. Simple forms of such personification are found very early on objects of every-day use, as the Praenestine fibula (C. I. L. XIV, 4123[1]), the Ficoroni cista (C. I. L. XIV, 4112 = I, 54), and several ancient pieces of pottery from the Esquiline cemetery and elsewhere.[27] Here, however, we have clearly a Grecism. The expressions employed, 'so-and-so made me,' or 'I am of so-and-so,' with warnings added, bear a striking resemblance to those on like objects from the Chalcidian colonies in Italy of an earlier date;[28] and the first two pieces named are surely of foreign workmanship.[29] Similar inscriptions, and others less stereotyped, on vases of a later date from Pompeii, the Danube provinces, Germany, and Gaul, show how widespread and enduring this custom was.[30]

A variety of personifications is present also in inscriptions of a different type. There is first the Duenos Inscription of the fourth century B. C., the exact purpose of which is still in doubt (see Egbert, Latin Inscriptions, pp. 346-7). Further, in certain late dedications of a city wall, a nymphaeum, an obelisk, a fountain and a Mithraic relief, the city, the nymphaeum, the obelisk, the water and the stone respectively speak:[31] in representations of divinities also the gods sometimes use the first person.[32] The majority, however, are epitaphs. Once the bones speak of themselves in the first person plural (C. I. L. X, 5469, Büch. 1135); but usually the stone does the talking. With the exception of a single address to the Manes (C. I. L. IX, 6315, Büch. 383), the stone always hails the passer-by; his attention may be called to other statements of the inscription which are given in the third person,[33] or the stone may give him warning,[34] or express a desire for libations and crowns (C. I. L. VI, 2335, 2357=Büch. 838, 9024), or utter some other pious wish (C. I. L. III, 6660=Büch. 296, VI, 21261). It is sometimes difficult to judge whether the stone or the person buried is supposed to be the speaker: but the number of certain personal inscriptions containing similar addresses is so great that it is safe to assume that in doubtful cases not the 'silent stone,' as it is called in an inscription of the time of Lucilius (Eph. Epigr. vol. 4, p. 297, no. 861, Büch. 53), but the deceased himself utters a voice from the tomb. These inscriptions, unlike those on the small objects, have no real connection with the similar Greek usage; for on the Greek dedications and epitaphs of pre-Roman times where the object uses the first person, in both prose and verse we have only a repetition of the simple formulae of the vases and other small objects.[35] It was left for the intense autobiographic feeling of the Romans to develop such personifications to any extent.

Apart from these pseudo-autobiographic inscriptions, those collected which contain genuine autobiographic forms still number over 2200. Their variety is amazing; but a few general observations are possible.

First, though they are widely scattered, their geographical distribution is not at all uniform. Italy, yielding less than four-sevenths of the total number of inscriptions, produces over five-sevenths of those containing autobiographic elements; outside of Italy relatively large numbers are found only in Dalmatia (75), Moesia Inferior (16) and Egypt (36). The scarcity prevailing in Greece and the Far East is due to two reasons, the official and stereotyped character of the Latin inscriptions from these regions and the use of Greek as a vernacular; in fact, the inscriptions of European Greece are confined to ten from Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace, and of the twelve from Asia Minor five are bilingual.[36] In the West the causes differ for different provinces. The dedications and epitaphs of legionary soldiers have to a high degree the official and impersonal form already noted in the East; this accounts for the few autobiographic inscriptions from the German frontier, Britain (14), and especially Dacia (10), where the Roman occupation was purely military. Africa and Gaul were much better Romanized: but here the general adoption of a brief and colorless type of epitaph confined personal utterances to narrow limits. For the paucity in Spain, which even produced autobiographic formulae (see below, p. 238), and was certainly important in a literary way, there seems to be no certain explanation.

Further, the inscriptions from each country generally group themselves about certain centers, and these not necessarily the ones yielding the largest totals of inscriptions. Of course in Italy Rome is at the head, with over half the Italian examples. In northern Italy Pola, Aquileia, Con-

cordia, Verona, Brescia, Milan and Ravenna are prominent, the large Christian cemetery at Concordia being specially noteworthy. In central Italy, Ostia, farther south, Capua, Naples, Pompeii and Benevento, are important, Pompeii for its *graffiti,* Capua for an interesting series of late Christian epitaphs.

Outside of Italy Salonae is the most prolific source of both pagan and Christian inscriptions containing autobiographic elements. Africa has three centers, Carthage, Lambaesis and Scherschel (ancient Caesarea); the last-named produced much sepulchral poetry. In Gaul Lyons is specially productive, and on the Rhine Mainz is the chief center.

As will later appear, these places, and many others, furnish us local and provincial types; the existence of such types is often due to peculiar circumstances. Thus the Egyptian inscriptions are almost entirely records of visitors to the famous sights of that land.

Regarding the classes of society that employed such autobiographic forms one fact is certain. Tacitus in the Agricola (chapter 1) indicates the antiquity of the literary autobiography and its early use by famous men, while he points out the infrequency of mere biographies of such aristocratic persons in his own day. The inscriptions containing autobiographic elements form an excellent commentary on this passage. Though at first, as it seems, only those of senatorial and equestrian rank introduce autobiographic matter into inscriptions, from before 100 B. C. to the end of the second century A. D., with barely an exception, only the lower classes write their epitaphs and dedications in this way; finally, at the later date those of higher rank take up these forms, by this time wide-spread and vulgarized. Thus after the two earliest examples, of a Scipio and a Popilius (C. I. L. I, 38 = VI, 1293, 138-7

B. C.; I, 551 = X, 6950, 132 B. C.), no secular official or private person of the two higher orders appears until the time mentioned, except in the peculiar form of the *laudatio* (C. I. L. VI, 1527, 10230, XIV, 3579; see p. 243), and the poetic epitaph of an unknown praetor who probably lived early in the second century, which is remarkable for its *raised* letters and lack of a prose dedication (C. I. L. VI, 1372, Büch. 426); and the same is true without exception of all priests everywhere. The assistants of Roman magistrates, however, and the Imperial officials of a humble station employ autobiography early and freely, while in the municipalities the Augustales alone, who were generally freedmen, display personal feeling to any extent.

Even certain portions of these lower classes do not express themselves readily in autobiographic forms. The stones set up by common soldiers and petty officers are, as already noted (p. 223), mostly impersonal. It is true that of the inscriptions containing autobiographic elements, from Egypt practically all, and from the Danube Provinces, Raetia and Germany over half, are military; but here the required explanations are at hand. The military inscriptions from Egypt, except two of the third century (C. I. L. III, 6594 and a), are simply scratched records of visitors to the sights: on the Danube, and in Raetia and Germany, the centers for such inscriptions, as Altenberg (Carnuntum), Alt Ofen (Aquincum), Mainz, O-Szöny (Brigetio) and Regensburg (Castra Regina), were either military camps or later outgrowths of military camps, and of course the inscriptions from them are predominantly military. On the other hand, the fleet at Misenum has given but four examples (C. I. L. X, 3336, 238-244 A. D.; 3409, 3646; 8131, Hadrian); Lambaesis, which grew from a camp, shows only three examples out of seven hundred military inscriptions (C. I. L. VIII, 2728, of 152 A. D., 3109, 3205); and

Dacia does not have one inscription of a soldier containing an autobiographic element. Slaves of the *domus Augusti* are just as reticent: there are only two examples from Rome (C. I. L. VI, 1609, 2d-3d cent., 7458, Ant. Pius) and four from Carthage (C. I. L. VIII, 12792, end 1st-beg. 2nd cent.; 12881, 12919, 13134, Hadrian-Antonines) in a total of over one thousand, and these are all as late as the second century. So in general, from the eighth to the tenth century of the city, in Rome autobiographic forms are cultivated by the great mixed population, including tradesmen and minor officials, and in the provinces by the *plebs* of the cities and towns; the higher official hierarchy adopts their usage first when the Empire begins to go to pieces.

As between prose and poetry, it may be said in general that the inscriptions written in prose far outnumber the others: at Rome alone, in pre-Augustan and Christian times, are there more poetic inscriptions. In fact, nine of the twelve pre-Augustan poetic inscriptions, including the very earliest, are from Rome and vicinity. But, during the earlier Empire, although Rome keeps a high average, it is passed by Spain, Germany and the eastern half of southern and central Italy; the predominance of Spain is not without significance, when we remember the number of literary men that country gave to Rome in the first and second centuries. Finally, in the Christian period, under the influence of Pope Damasus, Rome again takes the lead.

Turning now to a detailed examination of the several kinds of autobiographic inscriptions, we may divide them into dedications, with which are closely associated the *devotiones;* epitaphs, by far the largest number; honorary inscriptions, the smallest class; "autobiographic records," as the milestone of Publius Popilius; business documents (wax tablets of Iucundus, etc.); manufacturer's marks and

other inscriptions on small household objects (*instrumentum domesticum*); and lastly, the intensely personal *graffiti* from Pompeii and elsewhere. In each class prose and poetic examples are often conveniently discussed under separate heads.

The conservative adherence to ancient usages so characteristic of all religions, and especially of the narrow formalism of the Roman religion, is well shown in the prose dedications. From the third century B. C. to the sixth century A. D., the autobiographic element in both pagan and Christian examples is generally restricted to the use of a *solvi, posui, dedicavi* for the corresponding third person forms, or of a *meus* for the third person possessive; the regular dedicatory form is otherwise preserved, and sometimes both first and third persons occur together, as C. I. L. IX, 2164, of the third century: *Sex(tus) Pompeius Moderatus . . . vo<l>vit ara(m) domino Silvano . . . votum solvi et ara(m) dedicavi* (see also VI, 31187, of the same date). Sometimes in later inscriptions an *ego* is added before the dedicator's name.[37] This, however, is not an autobiographic strengthening, but a usage arising in the development of the language; from the Republican times the gradual loss of inflectional endings in the vulgar speech, which is reflected in the inscriptions, made necessary the use of the personal pronoun.

Even where autobiographic additions are found, consisting of inserted explanatory clauses, as *ut gratias ago* (C. I. L. VI, 269, 213 A. D.),[38] or a separate pious prayer at the close, as *reliquos mei rogo salvos* in C. I. L. VIII, 8448 (cf. VIII, 2641 = 18102), the rest of the inscription in general keeps the third person form.

Five instances only give us any detailed account of the occasion for the dedication;[39] one of these, from Moesia Inferior, runs: *cum primum veni Montanis et numina vidi,*

deabus votum vovi, ut potui pos[*u*]*i,* etc. (Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 41 (1902), p. 352, no. 71).

The case is different with the dedicatory poems. As they are not common enough to be run into set moulds, the autobiographic elements vary widely, and the free use of them is not prevented in any unusual way by the poetic form. The fact that most of the persons who employ such poetry are of higher rank and desire to give some account of their personal distinctions makes the poems still more individual. As a farther result of this natural desire, the god takes a second place, and the whole poem becomes primarily a panegyric of the dedicator.[40]

All these points are well illustrated by the dedication of the poet Avienus (C. I. L. VI, 537, Büch. 1530 A):

> Festus Musoni suboles prolesque Avieni,
> unde tui latices traxerunt, Caesia, nomen,
> Nortia, te veneror lare cretus Vulsiniensi,
> Romam habitans, gemino proconsulis auctus honor[e,
> carmina multa serens, vitam insons, integer aeum,
> coniugio laetus Placidae numeroq(ue) frequenti
> natorum exsultans. vivax sit spiritus ollis,
> cetera composita fatorum lege trahentur.[41]

The few Christian dedications in verse, however, are brief, sometimes only a line, and as conventional as their prose, especially the productions of Damasus:[42] the one exception noticed is that of Constantina, daughter of Constantine, whose position would lead us to expect something out of the ordinary from her (Inscr. Christ. II, p. 44, Büch. 301).

In connection with these poems we first meet the question of the authorship and originality of epigraphic poetry. In these dedications the case is usually clear. Once, in the instance just quoted, a professed poet, Avienus, makes the offering; two other poems are known both from inscriptions

and literary tradition, and were presumably transferred from manuscript to stone (C. I. L. XI, 3862 = Priapeum 14; V, 2803=Büch. 861; see Mommsen, Büch. *ad locc.*). The rest betray their home-made character by their commonplaces, the difficulty with which prosaic details are distorted into verse, and the sometimes faulty metre. The hints of the classic poets go back mainly to Virgil and Ovid, and are mere tags of a few words, except that one man of a humble official station has repeated several lines in an effort to make a good showing (C. I. L. IX, 3375, Büch. 250; see C. Hose, in Rhein. Mus. vol. 50 (1895), pp. 288-9). Where, as in C. I. L. III, 1894 = 8471 (Büch. 1531, 5th cent.), the composer does attempt a more elaborate and original production, he overshoots the mark.

The *devotiones,* which are nearest of kin to the dedications, are from their very nature both formulaic and intensely personal. They date from all periods; the earliest example, C. I. L. I, 818 = VI, 140, from Rome, is of the late Republic. Carthage and ancient Hadrumetum in Africa (see Bull. Arch. 1906, pp. 378-387) and the vicinity of Naples furnish the larger number.

Most of them are addressed to the gods or demons of the lower world. They may devote to these divinities, with all kinds of curses, some unknown wrongdoer, as in C. I. L. II, 462; but usually some special enemy is cursed. Often the relation of the person cursed and the person cursing is not mentioned, and it is only an inference that a scornful lover is devoted.[48] In Africa such curses are often aimed at the members of an opposing circus faction, with some such words as *haec nomina hominum et equorum qu(a)e dedi vobis cadan(t), precor bos,* found in one from Hadrumetum (Rev. Arch. Fourth Series, vol. 2 (1903), p. 175, no. 209).[49] These were as a rule placed in tombs, which were considered places under the spell of the infernal deities, where they

could injure the person cursed as they already had injured the dead.[45] Twice, however (C. I. L. XI, 1823; Eph. Epigr. vol. 7, p. 278, no. 827, Bath, late 2d cent.), similar curses are addressed to gods of healing springs, who are supposed on occasion to exercise a destructive and not a beneficial influence. Christianity here, as elsewhere, keeps the ancient form if not the spirit; for we have an example of the denunciation of an evil spirit couched in the same terms on a lead tablet of about the sixth century from Dalmatia (C. I. L. III, p. 961).

Generally these curses contain meaningless Greek words of supposed magical import, which make a kind of incantation. But real incantations also occur in autobiographic form. Two are love charms from Hadrumetum, in Greek letters;[46] a third is a bronze key at Naples, containing a prayer to Diana for protection, and mentioning also God and Solomon.[47]

Sepulchral inscriptions always give the best occasion for self-praise by the dead; this was emphatically the case in pagan Rome, where men thought that the dead did not fly away to heaven as spirits, but continued in an existence of some kind in the place of burial, so that they could be represented as speaking (see Roscher, *Inferi, Manes*). But some interfering elements are at work here as in the religious inscriptions. First, there is the tendency common to all epitaphs, ancient and modern, to adopt early certain formulae and cling to them. But second, beginning with the Augustan Age, the epitaphs assume in increasing numbers the form of real dedications to the *dei manes;* thus the religious conservatism present in the dedications operates here also.[48]

This conflict is plainly shown in both poetry and prose. First, the prose epitaphs, just as the dedications, often retain the common forms with the simple substitution of a

first person verb or pronoun for the corresponding third person, as in Eph. Epigr. vol. 8, p. 162, no. 663:

dis manibus | sacrum. Danae | Valeria vixit annis | XLV. Ti(berius) Claudius | Anoptes coniugi | benemerenti feci.

There results also the same curious mixture of persons referring to a single dedicator, thus (C. I. L. V, 3776):

v(iva) f(ecit) | Thoria L(uci) f(ilia) | Severa | sibi et M(arco) Ennio | M(arci) f(ilio) Primo | viro suo | et Baebiae L(uci) f(iliae) Collinae | filiae meae.

This usage, as in the religious inscriptions, begins in the last hundred years of the Republic,[49] extends throughout the Empire and continues in Christian times along with the preservation of the pagan formulae; examples are not uncommon in the fifth and sixth centuries.[50] But the resemblance to the dedications is more than superficial; for it is in precisely the *dis manibus* inscriptions, which are essentially dedications, that most of these variations in the formulae occur.[51]

Such variations are specially frequent in the formulae peculiar to grave inscriptions, above all in the expressions giving the length of time the living were with the dead. The usual clause is *cum quo* (or *qua*) *vixit annis,* with such additions as *concorditer;* but *vixi,* said by the dedicator, with the same phrases added, is fairly common. More frequent is the phrase *qui* (or *quae*) *vixit mecum annis,* or *mecum annis.* This well illustrates the conflict between the autobiographic feeling and formalism. The phrase may be a pure autobiographic invention, and not suggested by the corresponding *vixit cum eo,* which is much more rarely found:[52] on the other hand, *vixit mecum* is a stereotyped form used hundreds of times in pagan and Christian inscriptions as late as the fifth century,[53] where the rest of the inscription is impersonal. It is used in a few places, at

Rome the most, in the rest of Italy and the great centers of Dalmatia and Lyons a little, but, with two exceptions, C. I. L. XII, 2244, 2398, apparently not at all in the rest of the Roman world; a better example is not available of the strict geographical bounds to which even a common autobiographic phrase may be limited.

Similarly the dead person tells the number of years he lived in the words (*qui*) *vixi annis*, when the other persons named use the third person exclusively. In the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum the isolated first persons are often marked as mistakes: but when the other parts of the inscription are free from errors and the copy in the Corpus is transcribed directly from the stone, there is no reason to doubt that we have here valid examples of autobiographic expressions.

The development of these variations in sepulchral inscriptions is still more nearly parallel to that of the dedications. In the latter we noted the addition of an *ego* before proper names in later inscriptions, which was made necessary by the gradual loss of inflectional endings in the vulgar speech (see p. 227). But in a number of sepulchral inscriptions, too, none of them earlier than the third century (except C. I. L. VIII, 20718), the same usage is found. However, the phrase with *ego* here resembles a formula much more than in the dedications, as shown by the fact that here it is used in groups of inscriptions of the same time and place:[54] for example, it occurs several times in the Christian cemetery of Concordia.[55]

The variations mentioned so far have one characteristic which they share with most of the religious dedications, that the changes, however numerous, do not disturb the order of the usual formulae. Some other variations correspond more closely to a second group of the dedications, as in them both the impersonal phrases and the personal

phrases used in their stead are additions to the main skeleton of the inscription. These phrases, like the inserted explanatory clauses and pious prayers of the religious dedications, are inserted in the middle or added at the end of the ordinary type of inscriptions: they are all laudatory of the dead.

The one of these inserted phrases most used is *de se bene merenti* or *merito* or *meritae*. We find also sometimes *de me bene merenti*, etc., either alone, as in C. I. L. V, 1108, or with other autobiographic variations in the inscription, as in C. I. L. VI, 6669, early 1st cent., VIII, 19168, IX, 1702; this is thrice, in C. I. L. V, 3712, VI, 25444, 2d cent., XIII, 442, do., slightly, but not essentially, modified to *si qui de me bene meruerit, bene merenti a me* and *de me optime merit(a)e*. Closely connected in thought with this are a few stereotyped phrases like *mihi carissima*.[56]

Again, this eulogy of the dead may take the form, *de quo* (or *qua*) *nihil doluit nisi mortem*, with slight variations, the form being most common at Rome; beside it is found *de quo* (or *qua*) *nihil dolui nisi mortem*,[57] similarly varied.[58] The introduction of the first person causes still greater variations, as to *nihil dolui nisi quod me reliquid*, of C. I. L. VI, 25595, which strengthen the autobiographic effect; but the skeleton remains the same.[59]

Finally, the complaint of parents that they have made graves for their children which the children should have made for them is usually reduced to a simple prose or poetic formula, altered to suit particular events, as C. I. L. VI, 28644, *quot debuerat filius patri facere pater filio fecit*, IX, 374, *quod filios decuit facer[e] mater fecit filis*, and Bücheler, 164-178. But as early as Cicero's time we have expressions of the same type put into the first person; for in De Senectute, 84, he says, *cuius a me corpus est crematum, quod contra decuit ab illo meum*, where he undoubtedly is

borrowing from the language of the inscriptions. In C. I. L. VI, 22066, *quod vos decebat mihi fecisse, mater* [*feci*], the parallelism is still better marked. Here again we have the personal pronouns *ego* and *tu* added, but here, unlike the cases previously mentioned (pp. 227, 232), the pronouns have a strengthening force, as these inscriptions are much earlier, and the pronouns have not become necessary for clearness.[60] In fact, the autobiographic feeling is very strong, as personal pronouns have taken the place of nouns of relationship; and there is really a development of purely autobiographic forms.[61] Still these complaints are generally excrescences on an otherwise impersonal inscription, just as certain additions in the religious dedications.

So much for the variations in the prose epitaphs. The poetic epitaphs contain, so far as observed, but one instance of parallel expressions in the first and third persons. C. I. L. VI, 8553 (Büch. 1179) has the following distich:

> **quod meruit vivus, moriens quot et ipse rogavit,**
> **coniugi sue gratae praestitit ecce fides.**

In C. I. L. V, 7404 (Büch. 1180), the same distich occurs, but somewhat corrupted, with the first person:

> **quot merui vitam, moriens quot et ipse rogavi,**
> **coniugis o grati redditur ecce fides;**

and this is repeated in XI, 911 (Büch. 1181), and V, Suppl. Ital. 1283 (Büch. 1182). All other expressions of a formulaic character in verse noticed are either always in the third person alone, or the first person alone, without any variations between persons.

Having now examined the forms in which there is a variation between first and third person, we turn to the formulae purely autobiographic. These again illustrate the opposition between the natural autobiographic feeling and religious conservatism. Here it is certain that the formu-

lae are always expressed in the first person, and the very fact that they are stereotyped in this way proves how common the autobiographic feeling was. But this very use of formulae to convey personal feeling shows also the conservative tendency of the religious dedications; and the make-up of the inscriptions containing the autobiographic formulae indicates that they are treated as additions to the common forms, as are certain additions in the religious dedications already noted (see p. 227). For here too a distinction is made between the regular impersonal inscription and the extra personal expression, the latter being placed at the end or introduced as an added clause.

These autobiographic formulae fall under three heads, those with which the living address the dead, those on monuments set up by a man to himself, usually while still alive, and those placed by others in the mouths of the dead.

The first class contains a few simple expressions in prose and verse, usually either greetings or wishes for the dead. Autobiographic greetings, like the *have mihi, Luciliane* of C. I. L. III, 5959, are rare:[62] the wishes, always that the earth may rest lightly on the dead, are fairly common. The chief prose form is *opto sit tibi terra levis,* generally abbreviated;[63] the chief poetical forms are the *optamus cuncti, sit tibi ter(r)a levis* of the *equites singulares* at Rome (C. I. L. VI, 3191, 3308, Büch. 1460; cf. the *omnes optamus,* etc. of III, 4533 = 11294, Büch. 1461), and the distichs like *te, lapis, obtestor, leviter super ossa residas, ne nostro doleat conditus officio* (Büch. 1047-8, 1470-1475). Sometimes like wishes are found in the poets, as Tibullus 2, 4, 49-50, Ovid, Amores 3, 9, 67-8 (see p. 249), Martial, 5, 34, 9-10, 9, 29, 11-12: but the formulae mentioned do not occur in the literature, and it is not possible to establish a literary origin for them.

The personal feeling is here very weak. The dative in *have mihi* is "ethical," being a slight addition to the ordinary phrases of salutation; and the first persons in the wishes are quite conventional, while the variations found are slight. Occasionally a more personal touch occurs, as in the line, *mi fili, mater rogat ut me ad te recipias* on an African inscription (C. I. L. VIII, 9691, Büch. 151), which is altered so as to injure the metre and repeated on a Gallic stone (XII, 4938), or the poetry used in three separate inscriptions from ancient Auzia (C. I. L. VIII, 9080, 9081, 9192, Büch. 592-4), also with changes that warp the metre:[64] but these are decidedly the exception.

The Christian formulae of this class are much more personal. The most colorless, *qui praecessit nos in pace,* is apparently limited to Arbal and vicinity in Africa, between 352 and 519 A. D.[65] The others noticed are mostly pre-Constantinian; they are either appeals like *pet(e) pro nobis* (Bull. Crist. Second Series, vol. 4 (1873), p. 71),[66] or a more direct commendation to the saints, as in C. I. L. X, 4529, *corpus sanc[t]is(simum) comindavi, irene* (i. e., *εἰρήνη*), *tibi cum sanc[t]is,* and present many slight variations from the most common types.[67]

The autobiographic formulae of inscriptions set up by persons to themselves and others are more numerous, but represent the different phases of but one theme, the *iura sepulchrorum*: for these details, as already pointed out by Mommsen (Staatsrecht II³, 1 (1887), pp. 70-71), they are our sole source of information. Their language is close to that of the official inscriptions that are autobiographic only in appearance (see p. 218), the personal touch being often a single *meus* or *noster*: but the repeated forms are few.

Only one inscription giving the details of building a monument, C. I. L. XIV, 3857, has any personal formula, and there the words, *uti me viva determinavi,* are incidental.

The epitaphs, however, which name the persons who can have a place in the monument frequently contain autobiographic elements. They all have a legal and formulaic flavor, but the very fact that the provisions vary according to individual caprice tends to diminish the repeated formulae and modify them at will. In such formulae as do occur, like *quibus cavero, quos in testamento nominavero, quos manumisi,* there are always additions, if not changes, designed to make the reference more explicit;[68] in fact, the only case of an exact duplication is in two inscriptions from the same part of Rome, C. I. L. VI, 10173 and 19882, one of which is plainly copied from the other.

The formulae for the prohibitions of alienation and the notices of legal penalties are more often repeated exactly and are less vividly personal, as these points were determined more by fixed statutes than by individual taste and were more intimately associated with the religious character of the burial. The briefest pagan expression forbidding alienation, which is rarely extended, is *ne de nomine meo* (or *nostro*) *exeat:* this is restricted to Rome.[69] The more personal injunctions, which approach the stage of a formula, as *veto donari,* are likewise confined to Rome and Ostia.[70] A Christian formula of the fifth century, more elaborate than these, is found in Concordia; it runs (C. I. L. V, 2305): *rogo et peto omnem clerum et cuncta(m) fraternitatem ut nullus de genere vel aliquis in hac sepultura ponatur.*[71]

In the notices of penalties, which are more widely spread, the personal feeling is still less prominent. All that generally appears in autobiographic form is *post obitum meum* (or *nostrum*) or *post me* and like phrases, or *supra* (*corpora*) *nostra*;[72] where the prohibition is limited to heirs, the possessive is used with *heres;* twice, in C. I. L. III, 2107 (= 8589) and 13917, both from Salonae, the

only autobiographic elements are *decuriae meae* and *curiae nostr(a)e*. The first named form, the earliest instances of which date from the second century (Eph. Epigr. vol. 8, p. 367, no. 30, C. I. L. VI, 10791, Ant. Pius), was specially favored at Concordia and in the rest of northern Italy, and at Salonae, during the fourth and fifth centuries. At Concordia also appears a formula commending the sarcophagus to some organization for the purpose of seeing that the penalty is enforced (C. I. L. V, 8740, 8745, 8755).

Phrases of similar import are sometimes indifferently used by the dead or by the living who set up their own monument. These are twofold, either an entreaty not to disturb the tomb, or a wish that the person who does disturb it may meet with the sorrow of the living. They vary somewhat in order and detail, but the first always has a phrase like *rogo (deos) superos inferosque ut,*[73] the second, *si quis manus intulerit, . . . opto.*[74]

When the dead is represented as speaking, the ideas expressed in formulae are various. First, just as the living wish that the earth may rest lightly on the dead, (see p. 235), so the dead addresses the passer-by, in either prose or verse, saying, "speak, I pray, passer-by, 'may earth rest lightly on thee'"![75] This is particularly common in Spain, in fact, so common that it often appears in abbreviated form; e. g., C. I. L. II, 415 (Büch. 1453), *d(ic) r(ogo) p(raeteriens), s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis).*[76] And as on the earlier Christian monuments the living ask the dead to pray for them (see p. 236), so in much later Christian times the dead say, *qui legis, ora pro me, rogo vos omnes, orate pro me,* etc.[77]

But further, the words of the dead have their own typical formulae. Most of the prose inscriptions are dialogues. The bystander says, *ave* or *vale:* the dead replies, *bene valeas qui me salutas.* This seems a late form, for the in-

scriptions containing it generally exhibit the mistakes of a later time.[78] Again, sometimes the thoughts of the dead about life and death are given in conventional prose or poetical forms. These clearly show the difference between pagan and Christian ideas: in the pagan type the dead, though conceived of as living, strangely utters the Epicurean 'I was not, I am not, it makes no difference,' which denies the fact of his existence;[79] the Christian says, *credo (me) resurgere,* as in C. I. L. X, 1377, 1380, 4525, not earlier than the seventh century. Finally, the inscription may become a warning to the person addressed, as C. I. L. VIII, 9913, *viator, quod tu, et ego, quod ego, et omnes* (see also XI, 6243, Rev. Arch. Fourth Series, vol. 6 (1905), p. 493, no. 210), and C. I. L. II, 2262, *tu qui stas et legis titulum meum, lude, iocar[e], veni* (see also 1434, 1877, the latter having abbreviations).

The poetic bits not already mentioned which are repeatedly spoken by the dead as formulae are varied and instructive. The most common is the line addressed to their parents by children who died at an early age, as *noli dolere;* several variations of this form appear. The formula is found as early as the reign of Augustus: the earliest examples come from Rome (Büch. 145-8, cf. 1537-44, and add C. I. L. VI, 36654). Other distichs and parts of poems are found at most four or five times, and are often incorporated with other lines. Once the deceased boasts of his poor but honest life, in C. I. L. III, 2835 (Büch. 992), before Claudius, VI, 2489 (Büch. 991), 29 A. D.:

vixi quad potui (variant, quod volui) semper bene pauper honeste,
fraudavi nullum, nunc (variant, quod) iuvat ossa mea.

Again, he speaks to the living, often pointing out that death is ever at hand:[80] in others, a contrast is made between the

past and present existence, to the latter's advantage or disadvantage.[81] The last two classes resemble closely the similar prose formulae.

Since these poetic formulae were common property, the combination of several of them was a matter of course; and so there exist several pieces of autobiographic patchwork. But even these patchworks go by rule. There are four which are identical in the arrangement of the pieces; the words are somewhat changed, but with the object in each case of fitting the forms to the details of the particular life. The whole runs about thus:

tu qui praeteriens spectas monimentum meum,
  aspice quam indigne sit data vita mea.
annorum septem vixi dulcissima patri,
  octavo ingrediens (or escendens) animam deposui meam.
noli dolere, mater, aetati meae,
  Fatus quod voluit abstulit. (varied)
te, lapis, obtestor, leviter super ossa quiescas,
  ne tenerae aetati tu gravis esse velis.[82] (varied)

At this point the question may be raised of the origin of these repeated poetic formulae and especially the manner in which they were transferred from one epitaph to another. All agree that the prose forms are of Roman origin and part of the regular stock of the stone-cutters. For the poetic formulae two theories have been advanced. The older theory, that of Cagnat, is that the stone-cutters had certain handbooks or collections from which they drew the forms they employed on the epitaphs (Rev. d. Phil. vol. 13 (1889), p. 51 ff.). This has been lately disputed by Lier (in Philologus, vol. 62 (1903), pp. 445 ff., 563 ff., 63 (1904), p. 54 ff.); he thinks that the persons themselves copied the inscriptions from other stones, particularly the eulogies of great men set up in public places, these other epitaphs being in turn modeled on Greek sources.

Of these two theories, the first is much nearer the truth as applied to the autobiographic formulae. There is absolutely no proof of the use of such formulae in the epitaphs of distinguished men; the one early epitaph of a noted man we have (C. I. L. I, 38 = VI, 1293, Büch. 958) contains none of these forms, and they had developed long before the higher classes again took up autobiography, at the end of the second century. Further, when the same lines occur on monuments of approximately the same date in different parts of the Roman world as far separated as Rome and Dalmatia (C. I. L. III, 2835, VI, 2489, see p. 239), Moesia Inferior and Syria (C. I. L. III, 13809 = 14217[1], Büch. 859, 3d cent.; 14165[1], late 3d cent.), with slight variations which are easily explained as stone-cutter's errors, the chances of copying are reduced to a minimum. To be sure in one instance there is a certain transference of a poem of three lines, name and all (C. I. L. XI, 3963, Büch. 591; Eph. Epigr. vol. 8, p. 380, no. 80), and two other poems are repeated, with an appreciable difference in date between the examples, where one serves to correct the other:[83] but these are isolated cases. It is only fair to suppose that the stone-cutters had a supply of these common forms at hand, not necessarily in regular books, to offer as suggestions, just as they do now. In fact, the two advertisements we have of stone-cutters, one, C. I. L. VI, 9556, *d m | titulos scri | bendos vel | si quid ope | ris marmor | ari opus fu | erit hic ha | bes,* the other, X, 7296, ατηλαὶ | ἐνθάδε | τυποῦνται καὶ | χαράσσονται | ναοῖς ἱεροῖς | σὺν ἐνεργείαις | δημασίαις, | *tituli | heic | ordinantur et | sculpuntur | aidibus sacreis | cum operum | publicorum,* show definitely that the composition and arranging of inscriptions according to certain forms was part of their business (see Huebner, Prol. to the Exempla, p. xxv ff., xxx.). A short time would suffice to show them that it was easier to use the same forms over again, if these met

the wishes and purses of their patrons; and the formulae thus developed would after a time become widely known among the profession, either in certain localities or over a good part of the Roman world. Any variations in the formulae can be accounted for in one of at least three ways, as errors of the stone-cutter following his copy, or as made necessary by the different relationships for which the same form was used, or as caused by the officiousness of the person ordering, who wished to improve on the regular form, and generally spoiled the metre.

So "good form" and religious conservatism, as shown in the mere variation from third to first person, with the retention of the regular form, or in the development of an autobiographic formula, did their best to restrain the strong autobiographic feeling: but it would not down. Less than half the examples of epitaphs collected can by any stretch be brought under these two heads; the rest show more individual traits. This is not to deny that the remaining epitaphs often keep close to the ordinary outlines for such inscriptions, or that personal and impersonal are often distinctly kept apart: it means simply that in an inscription true autobiographic elements are present which are not repeated elsewhere. To discuss all these details would involve a separate account of each inscription; it must suffice here to take up the prose and poetic epitaphs separately, and, having classified them into large groups, point out the noteworthy features of each group.

Of the prose epitaphs there are but few types, and these, as might be expected, express the same ideas as those for which a formula was developed. First, where the living set up inscriptions to the dead, and do not include themselves, as a rule they do the talking. Very rarely, as in C. I. L. V, 8856, late, VI, 18378, 165 A. D., XIII, 1508, 6th cent., Bull. Crist. Second Series, vol. 4 (1873), p. 56, 4th

cent., are they content with noting that they wrote the inscription. Plain and unadorned autobiographic details are also rare and brief; the living person gives such facts as the time when he first met or married the dead, the number of children, or the years 'we lived together.'[84] Most of these epitaphs, especially those set up by husbands to wives or wives to husbands, assume the character of laudations, which ring about as true as the corresponding praises on modern tombstones. Sometimes the same ideas are uttered as in the variations of the type *de quo nihil dolui nisi mortem,* as in C. I. L. VI, 11511, 25022 (see p. 233): generally, however, the encomium is more pronounced. Using a wealth of superlatives, the person living ascribes to the dead every virtue;[85] indeed, he sometimes says the dead has left him a debt of gratitude he can never repay.[86] A typical instance is the late inscription, C. I. L. VI, 29580:

d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum). | Urbanae coniugi dulcissime | et castissimae ac rarissimae, cuius praeclarius | nihil fuisse certus, hoc etiam titulo honorari | meruit; quae ita mecum cum summa iucunditate adque simplicitate in diem vitae suae | egit, quam adfectioni coniugali tam | industria morum suorum; haec ideo | adieci ut legentes intelligant quantum | nos dilexerimus. | Paternus b(ene) m(erenti) f(eci).

How insincere these protestations sometimes are may be inferred from the one epitaph set up by an honest man, C. I. L. VI, 29149. He begins by dedicating it to his 'dearest wife,' but goes on to say that 'on the day of her death I gave greatest thanks in presence of gods and men'; this shows clearly the value of conventional praise when compared with the truth.

The immediate inspiration of these praises seems to have been the public *laudationes* delivered for the dead;[87] three of these, C. I. L. VI, 10230, of Murdia, and 1527, of Turcia, both of the Augustan Age, and XIV, 3579, of Matidia,

mother-in-law of Hadrian, are in part extant on inscriptions. These are more carefully elaborated for delivery than the ordinary praises, but the general outlines of the thought and the turns of speech are much the same. The humbler classes then, it seems, modeled their more extended laudations on those of the rich, and the usage so borrowed became a fairly regular form; an Augustalis of Brescia, after indicating that the stone was erected in accordance with his will, says expressly, *deinde hoc elogium breve* (C. I. L. V, 4445).

Separate mention must be made of the pagan epitaphs in which living persons commend others to the dead. Examples are: the expression, *parce matrem tuam et patrem et sororem tuam Marinam, ut possint tibi facere post me sollemnia*, in C. I. L. VI, 13101, late; VI, 9349 b, of the late Republic; VI, 18817. The underlying idea is that of the other commendations to deities associated with death, the *devotiones* (see p. 229): but here the Manes are to protect and not harm the dead. This, it seems to me, is also the idea of the Christian commendations to saints already mentioned (p. 236).

The laudations just discussed are not necessarily confined, however, to inscriptions in which the living are not included; they are likewise found in a few well distributed examples where living persons set up the stone to themselves and the dead.[88] Nor do these praises prevent the dead from speaking too in the same epitaph; this is rare, but there are at least two instances, C. I. L. III, 3989, VII, 9513, both late.

Second, where the dedicator (presumably living, though *vivus* or its equivalent is not always present) includes himself in the inscription as well as others, the prevalent autobiographic expressions refer to the erection and preservation of the monument, and thus exactly correspond to the

second class of autobiographic formulae noticed previously (p. 236). Indeed, such epitaphs as these are all so legal and conventional that it is often difficult to determine whether a given phrase is peculiar to one inscription or occurs as a repeated formula; and some formulae could be added to those already enumerated, if greater allowance were made for variations in language.

The types are thus practically the same. There are first the many epitaphs giving details of the construction of a monument and the persons for whom it is intended, at some length. Here a new variety claims attention, composed of certain examples from *columbaria*. These are rather records of the purchase of niches and the assignment of them than sepulchral inscriptions: for instance, as a part of C. I. L. VI, 33454, of the late Republic or early Empire, we have, *emi de G(aius) Matius G(ai) l(ibertus) Cyrus* (sic) *ollas IIX* (see also VI, 23400, 28687, 28778; Inscr. Christ. I, 395, of 391 A. D.). Further, the usual prohibitions against alienation and the statement of penalties to be inflicted occur. Here again the language is formulaic: but it must be noted that the same ideas, when expressed in repeated formulae, produce formulae of the very weakest personal nature (see p. 237).

The analogy between the individual autobiographic epitaphs and the formulae is shown in still another way. Certain formulae already mentioned (p. 238) are put indifferently into the mouths of the dead or the living; in the same manner a few individual autobiographic epitaphs contain similar remarks regarding the funeral, the desecration of the grave, and the like, spoken by any person interested. For example, in four instances the dead give information of funeral rites (C. I. L. II, 2146, cf. VI, 12649), or of the monument (C. I. L. I, 1253 = X, 1049, VI, 18677 a; Bull. Arch. 1903, p. 560, no. 7, Africa). Again, either the dead,

or the living setting up a monument to themselves or to the dead, hope that violation or neglect may cause sufferings like their own: for example, in C. I. L. VI, 7308, of about 50 A. D., a woman, referring to her dead son, says, *si quis huhic ammuerit, iendem dolorem experiscatur quem ego experta sum.*[89] Twice (C. I. L. VI, 14098, 14099) the living commend desecrators to the Sun's wrath. Further, the dead, especially on later Christian tombs, beg that the monument may receive no harm, as in C. I. L. V, 7793, 568 A. D., *rogo te . . . ne me tangas nec sepulcrum meum violis, nam ante t[ri]bunal aeterni iudicis mecum causam dicis.*[90] Then any dedicator may appeal for care of the tomb, as in C. I. L. XIII, 1849 (Büch. 1594), *hunc titulum quem feci coiugi carae et mihi vivus oro flor[i]bus Florum hilares condecoretis amici* (see also VI, 23363, a). Finally, any one concerned may wish all good to passers-by who read the epitaph; this last is practically formulaic, appearing in variations of *opto valeas qui legeris.*[91]

There is one important class of these *iura sepulchrorum,* however, which has no parallel in the formulae. They record the willing of certain properties or moneys, usually to a college or municipality, on the condition of performance of certain annual rites.[92] The person making the bequest may be either living or dead. There can be no doubt that these are abstracts from wills, as an inscription from Aquileia (C. I. L. V, Suppl. Ital. 181) definitely indicates this fact. That the abstracts labeled *caput ex testamento* have been considered pseudo-autobiographic (see p. 221), the abstracts not labeled autobiographic, is due to the fact that the former are distinctly called quotations, while the latter are conceived of as direct personal utterances.

In the third place, where the dead person is represented as speaking from the tomb, whether as really or nominally dead, there is greater variety. Besides isolated autobio-

graphic details, we find here for the first time extended autobiographies, as those of the charioteer Calpurnianus (C. I. L. VI, 10047, 3d-4th cent.) and of Quintus Aemilius Secundus (C. I. L. V, *136, Not. d. Scav. 1880, p. 243, Eph. Epigr. vol. 4, p. 537 ff., ca. 3 B. C.-6 A. D.). The latter I quote in full:

Q(uintus) Aemilius Q(uinti) f(ilius) | Pal(atina tribu) Secundus, [in]| castris divi Aug(usti) s[ub]| P(ublio) Sulpi[c]io Quirinio le[g(ato) Aug(usti)] | C[a]esaris Syriae honori | bus decoratus, pr[a]efect(us) | cohort(is) Aug(ustae) (primae), pr[a]efect(us) | cohort(is) (secundae) Classicae; idem | iussu Quirini censum egi | Apamenae civitatis mil | lium homin(um) civium (centum septendecim);| idem missu Quirini adversus | Ituraeos in Libano Monte | castellum eorum cepi; et ante | militem praefect(us) fabrum, | delatus a duobus co(n)s(ulibus) ad ae | rarium, et in colonia | quaestor, aedil(is) (iterum), duumvir (iterum), | pontifexs. | Ibi positi sunt Q(uintus) Aemilius Q(uinti) f(ilius) Pal(atina tribu) | Secundus f(ilius) et Aemilia Chia lib(erta).| H(oc) m(onumentum) amplius h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur).

This easily degenerates into self-laudation, varying from a line or so, as in C. I. L. V, 7446, *vixsi frugi*,[93] to more elaborate praises found in a later period, as C. I. L. VI, 12013 (note also here the resemblance to Cicero, De Senectute, quoted on p. 233), 18659, VIII, 724 (=Büch. 1612, 3d cent.), all of which are as unreliable as the praises of false friends.

These praises are often accompanied by an address to passers-by, as in C. I. L. III, 14406 a, *resta, viator, et lege titulo nestro, dunc leces et perausas* (cf. III, 3980, IX, 5860, Bull. Arch. 1907, p. 241, Africa). Similar addresses are also found alone. The person buried may give a simple greeting like the *amice, have et vale, ego hic situs sum,* of C. I. L. VI, 25548 (cf. VI, 24600, Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 21 (1893), p. 390, no. 64), or ask for such a greeting C. I. L. VIII, 20394), or for a *sit tibi terra levis* (Rev.

Arch. Fourth Series, vol. 3 (1904), p. 298, no. 22; cf. a similar impersonal form in Eph. Epigr. vol. 7, p. 375, no. 1247). Once he adds to the greeting a plea for good will and care of his parents (C. I. L. III, 14206[21]); more commonly he utters a word of advice, as in C. I. L. V, 3466, *vos moneo in Nemese ne fidem habeatis; sic sum deceptus. Ave, vale.*[94] In the same way consolation or advice is given to relatives and friends, or gratitude is expressed, thus: *linque iam pl[e]re, marite, lacrimas, quoniam me tibi tullit genesis iniqua et p(ost) m(ortem) nihil* (C. I. L. X, 4022); *havete, amici et amicae boni, Eutyche et Oeconome et Princeps, ago memoriae vestrae gratias. Bonis bene* (C. I. L. VI, 14537.)[95]

Utterances of grief are found only now and then, as in C. I. L. VI, 33473, *ann(um) vicensimum exsigens misera occidi,* of the beginning of the Empire (see also VI, 25075, Christian, 27227, XIII, 7119); their logical place is on the tombstones of children who died at an early age, for example, C. I. L. V, 1725, VIII, 21200. Brief sentences referring to death and the life hereafter are more frequent; with few exceptions (C. I. L. VI, 5817, 23709, XII, 5193), the nature of the state after death is indicated and commented upon. In every instance this state is one of peace and rest; thus a freedman of a Flavian emperor says, *aliquando securus sum* (C. I. L. VI, 10251, a).[96] Once also, in Inscr. Christ. I, 1087, of 544 or 533 A. D., the Christian belief in immortality is spoken of at greater length than in the conventional forms (see p. 239).

This enumeration perhaps does not exhaust the possibilities, but is intended to suggest the general range of ideas: what is to be noticed is that here, as in the other prose epitaphs, the same commonplace ideas are emphasized that are expressed in a more stereotyped way in the formulae.

The sepulchral inscriptions containing poetry follow much the same lines as the prose epitaphs. A somewhat simpler classification, however, can be adopted, that is, into epitaphs in which the living speak to or about the dead and themselves, and those in which the dead are supposed to address the living. Sometimes both kinds of addresses are found in the same epitaph, and occasionally the whole assumes the form of a real dialogue: these examples are treated separately as a third division.

The utterances of the living are much less frequent than those of the dead, except in Christian epitaphs, in which the reverse is true. A poetic subscription in autobiographic form, as, *haec, Germana, tibi Theodorus frater et heres | quae relegant olim saecla futura dedi,* in C. I. L. V, 6240 (Büch. 1434, Christian), is rare;[97] still less common are the brief narrations of autobiographic details, as in C. I. L. II, 3871 (Büch. 978, Augustan), III, 14237, VI, 28753 (Büch. 108), X, 1688 (Büch. 888), or references to the erection and purpose of the monument, as in C. I. L. VI, 25547 (Büch. 1293) *haec coniunx posui tibi dona merenti, hic erit et nobis una aliquando domus,* X, 5819 (Büch. 641), XII, 1036 (Büch. 203, 3d cent.), Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 37 (1900), p. 510, no. 196. A similar scarcity of brief subscriptions and unadorned autobiographic details has already been noted in the prose epitaphs set up by the living (pp. 242-3).

More often certain ideas which appear in the formulae are present, though generally forming but a part of a longer poem. In particular the wish is expressed that the earth may rest lightly on the dead (see p. 235).[98] Here the indebtedness to the poets is much more evident than for the formulae: in fact, one man has merely copied the lines of Ovid, Amores, 3, 9, 67-8, *ossa quieta, precor, tuta requiescite in urna, et sit humus cineri non onerosa tuo,* and

substituted the name *Zopyre* for *tuta* (C. I. L. VIII, 12302, Büch. 1242). Further, we have again the complaint that the living have done for the dead what the dead should have done for them (see p. 233).[29]

But most of the poems are more elaborated. In those most highly developed there are first certain details about the life of the dead, giving such information as name, age, relationship, cause of death and relatives left behind. Then follows a *laudatio,* like those of the similar prose inscriptions; the praises consist of the usual commonplace ideas. Thus the dead possessed every good quality and can hardly be adequately honored by the poor monument; the Fates have been most cruel and the death was sudden and unexpected; the bereaved person's grief is terrible and his only wish is to join the dead. Those who have gone, it is hoped or confidently asserted, are resting happily in the Elysian Fields, or have even become gods. In conclusion there is often an appeal to the Manes or to the passer-by, a wish that the earth may rest lightly on the dead, or a simple statement about the person who set up the stone. Of course all these elements by no means occur in every poem: but the laudatory remarks are there, even if others are absent, whether altogether omitted or contained in a separate prose inscription. To illustrate this we may quote C. I. L. VIII, 403 = 11511 (Büch. 1329), in which the usual details are in prose, and VIII, 152 (Büch. 516), which is entirely in verse. The first runs:

d(is) m(anibus) s(acrum). | Mevia Felicitas vixit | annis (quadraginta). Q(uintus) Calpurnius | Fortunatus maritus coniu | gi karissime posuit.

non digna coniunx cito vita [exire de]| crevisti misella.
vivere debue | ras annis fere centu(m) licebat,|
fuit enim forma certior mo | resque facundi,

fuit et pu | dicitia quam in alis nec | fuisse dicam nec esse | contendam.
set quia | sunt Manes, sit tibi ter | ra levis. | h(ic) s(ita) e(st).

The other reads:

Urbanilla mihi coniunx verecunda plena hic sita est,
Romae comes negotiorum socia parsimonio fulta.
Bene gestis omnibus cum in patria mecum rediret,
Au miseram Carthago mihi eripuit sociam.
Nulla spes vivendi mihi sine coniuge tali:
Illa domum servare meam, illa et consilio iuvare.
Luce privata misera quescit in marmore clusa.
Lucius ego coniunx hic te marmore texi.
Anc nobis sorte dedit fatu(m), cum luci daremur.[100]

Apart from these longer poems, there are a few short ones, each of which deals with one special item of the various kinds of praises just noted: thus in C. I. L. VI, 15225, (Büch. 204) we have:

si pro virtute et animo fortunam habuissem,
magnificum monimentum hic aedificassem tibi;
nunc quoniam omnes mortui idem sapimus, satis est.[101]

In all these eulogies there is little distinction between pagan and Christian epitaphs, as in both the expressions of grief and undue praise are equally strong.[102] Still in the latter the living sometimes find a consolation unknown to the pagans in the belief that the dead person has surely gone to heaven. Thus C. I. L. X, 1230 (Büch. 739), says at the end:

coniugio nostro nec mors [d]ivortia ponet.
concordes animas Christ[u]s revocabit in unum.[103]

Special mention must be made in passing of the longest poem in the entire collection, C. I. L. VIII, 212, 213 (Büch. 1552), of one Titus Flavius Secundus living at Cillium in the time of the Antonines, on a monument for other members of his family. Its theme is the beauty and

value of the monument to which it is affixed; and the interesting fact is, that the monument as described by travelers measures up well with the glowing terms of the inscription.

Second, where the dead person speaks, the ideas he expresses are again those of the prose epitaphs in which he is represented as talking. Regular autobiographic details, however, or rather, self-laudations, are in the poetry the rule and not the exception. These differ very greatly in length. Occasionally there are only a couple of lines which give the person's name and age or note the fact that a certain relative erected the tombstone, thus: C. I. L. XI, 5882 (Büch. 1843), of the first or second century, *Nassius hic situs sum L(uci) l(ibertus) Amandus, parvolus | aeterna conditus in requie;* C. I. L. IX, 5806 (Büch. 985) *hic mihi hoc posuit mors mea quoi doluit,* a phrase practically repeated in V, 4170 (Büch. 163).[104] But more often the narrative is of greater extent. Two types of such narratives had developed about the end of the second century B. C. The first type makes no appeal to the passer-by, but gives the name and rank of the person buried, if that has not already been stated in prose, and adds words of self-praise, varying from four or five lines to a long poem which rings the changes on the stock ideas already noted several times, some of which are repeated in the discussion of the second type (see *infra*). This first type is earliest found in Rome. Our first certain poem containing autobiographic elements is of this character; one of the Scipios, praetor in 139 B. C., after a list of his offices, says (C. I. L. I, 38 = VI, 1293, Büch. 958):

> virtutes generis mieis moribus accumulavi,
> progenie mi genui, facta patris petiei,
> maiorum optenui laudem ut sibei me esse creatum
> laetentur; stirpem nobilitavit honor.

This type is always favored by the higher officials,[105] besides large numbers of the common people.[106]

The second type is more complicated. When fully worked out, it begins with a request to the passer-by to stop and read. Next comes the relation of autobiographic details, which may vary from a plain statement of name and occupation to an ornate description and long eulogy. Throughout the latter are strewn the thoughts familiar from the prose epitaphs. The most frequent idea is the complaint about the suddenness of death and the cruelty of the Fates; in the pagan examples the notion of death as a rest from trouble is much rarer than in the prose. On the contrary, the Christian examples speak very often of the joys of immortality. Any special consolation addressed to the living is also rare, and then is liable to take a stereotyped form like *noli dolere,* etc. (see p. 239). After all this, the poem concludes with a second address to the passer-by. The variations in this last find their counterpart in the prose epitaphs. Sometimes the reader (or mortals generally, including him) is dismissed with a word; again, a wish for better fortune on his part or a warning that death awaits him is added. The usual desire also that he may express to the dead the wish *sit tibi terra levis* is stated both in the stereotyped formulae and more freely; twice (C. I. L. VIII, 7759, Büch. 1327; X, 8131, age of Hadrian), the phrase of Ovid, Trist. 3, 3, 76, *Nasonis molliter ossa cubent,* which he uses to conclude his own fictitious autobiographic epitaph, is borrowed, and the name changed to fit, thus destroying the metre. This appeal may be expanded into a general request to those above for the care of the grave and celebration of ceremonies.

A good example of this second type, shorter than some, is C. I. L. V, 6808 (Büch. 63), written not long before the Christian era:

G(ai) Paguri G(ai) l(iberti) Gelot[i]s.
hospes resiste et tumulum hunc excelsum aspic[e],
quo continentur ossa parvae aetatulae.
sepulta heic (haec, MS.) sita sum, verna quoius aetatula (ae, MS.).
gravitatem officio et lanificio praestitei.
queror fortunae cassum tam iniquom et grave[m].
nomen [s]i quaeres, exoriatur (exoraturi, MS.) Salviae,
valebis hospis, opto ut seis (sanctis, MS.) felicior.[107]

The earliest appearance of this second type may at first seem doubtful. The earliest example on stone is the epitaph of one Philotimus from Rome, from the earlier part of the first century B. C. (C. I. L. VI, 33919 a (Büch. 848); for the date see Kubitschek, in Arch. Epigr. Mitth. vol. 17 (1894), p. 161. This is duplicated, with change of name and other slight modifications, in an epigram ascribed by Gellius (1, 24) to Pacuvius, said by him to have been placed on the poet's tomb, which must have been at Tarentum, where he died about 130 B. C. (see Teuffel-Schwabe, trans. Warr, p. 155). But the entire lack of connection of Pacuvius with this sepulchral form, as pointed out by Bormann,[108] seems clear. As he says, this epigram could not have emanated from Tarentum at the time, and was never used for the tomb of Pacuvius or written by him; Varro, in his *De poetis* borrowed for Pacuvius a sepulchral form common in Rome from Sulla to Cicero's death, as he used for Plautus and Naevius epigrams of a literary character which have long since been shown to have no relation with those authors or their tombs; and Gellius, whose source here is the *De poetis,* made a mistake in all three cases when using that source. Still less, I may add, did Pacuvius have anything to do with the general type under discussion; this is found already in a fine epitaph of the Gracchan period, C. I. L. I, 1007 = VI, 15346 (Büch. 52), where the stone, not a person, speaks. In short, this second type is clearly

of Roman origin, connected with no name and dating back nearly as far as the first type: it becomes common in Rome and elsewhere as early as the time of Caesar (see C. I. L. I, 1009 = VI, 10096, Büch. 55, ca. Caesar, 1027 = VI, 9545, Büch. 74, late Rep.; 1220 = IX, 1837, Büch. 960, Caesar: cf. I, 1006 = VI, 13696, Büch. 11, Accius).

This second type, however, is not always so completely worked out; often the dismissal of the reader at the end is wanting,[109] and as frequently the appeal at the beginning is absent.[110] But in any event, besides the self-laudatory part, there is always at least one address to a second party.

The Christian inscriptions in which the dead speak all conform to one of these two types: they add only the statements of hopes aroused by belief in Heaven and trust in Christ, and an occasional address to some saint. Thus for the first type may be cited Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 79, no. 6 (Büch. 1432):

(H)elpis dicta fui, Siculae regionis alumna,
quam procul a patria coniugis egit amor,
quo sine maesta dies, nox anxia, flebilis hora,
nec solum caro sed spiritus unus erat.
lux mea non clausa est tali remanente marito,
maioriq(ue) animae parte superstis ero.
porticibus sacris iam non peregrina quiesco
iudicis aeterni testificata thronum,
ne qua manus bustum violet, nisi forte iugalis
haec iterum cupiat iungere membra suis,
ut thalami tumuliq(ue) comis nec morte revellar
et socios vitae nectat uterq(ue) cinis;[111]

and for the second type Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 273, no. 3 (Büch. 756):

aspicite venientes hic mea membra sepulta:
hic recubo felix parba etate peremta.
Felicia mic(h)i nomen est ex progenie ductum,
octavo etatis in s(ae)clo gesseram anno.

dulcis eram patri et garrula matri,
serbis eram leta, tota me leta ferebam.
non vitium mors, consuetudo propria natis,
virginio iam in cetu nunc letior adsto.
ultime cum dominus totum concusserit orbem,
tunc cineres (i)sti mundo pereunte resurget.[112]

In the same way the Greek sepulchral poems found in connection with Latin poetry or prose, mostly of the first and second centuries, conform to the same types;[113] exceptions are of course the stock complaint to Hades (C. I. L. VI, 15038, Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca, 578), and the Greek epigrams of Sulpicius (C. I. L. VI, 33976, Kaibel, Ep. 618, ca. 94 A. D.).

But these two types do not include the entire number in which the dead speak; for there are a few briefer inscriptions which utter the well-worn thoughts that have been so often mentioned before. There are first the usual wishes that the reader may say, *sit tibi terra levis* or words to that effect,[114] or for the proper celebration of funeral rites, as in C. I. L. III, 4185 (Büch. 578), which is paralleled in thought by Martial 10, 61, an epitaph of Erotion; or again, there may be warnings against desecration (C. I. L. VI, 5767, Büch. 1101, 1st cent., XI, 4126, Büch. 194), and good wishes for those who read (C. I. L. V, 7430, Büch. 1464, X, 6616, Büch. 127) and others (C. I. L. VIII, 8123, Büch. 1287). Sententious advice is also bestowed on the living, as the *nihil sumus et fuimus mortales. [r]espice lector, in nihil ab nichilo quam cito recidimus* of C. I. L. VI, 26003 (Büch. 1495);[115] in this and other examples the inscription has the general form of the second type just discussed. Further the feeling is once more expressed that the dead should rather have erected the stone for the living (C. I. L. III, 729, Büch. 1485; see p. 233). And again, those *sententiae,* some of an Epicurean nature, giving vent

to the joy of escape from life, occur; for example, C. I. L. VI, 18131 (Büch. 244), *quod edi bibi, mecum habeo, quod reliqui, perdidi.*[116] The last named approach closely to the general *sententiae* which are spoken of above (see p. 217) as not truly autobiographic; the line between the two is rather uncertain. Finally there are the *centos,* poems of several disjointed parts in various metres, as C. I. L. VI, 13528 (Büch. 1559, last half 2d cent.), 21975 (Büch. 67, ca. 100-50 B. C.), and VIII, 3319 (Büch. 1608); similar noble patchworks of the regular formulae have already been cited (see p. 240).

Third, when both living and dead speak on the same epitaph, for the most part there is no real dialogue, simply inscriptions of the two kinds placed on separate sides of the same stone, or at best a juxtaposition without organization. We may cite for instance C. I. L. I, 1011 = VI, 9499 (Büch. 959), dating from about the time of Sulla's death; at the right, under a woman's name, we read:

viva Philematium sum | Aurelia nominitata, |
casta, pudens, volgei | nescia, feida viro.|
vir conleibertus fuit | eidem, quo careo | eheu,|
ree fuit ee vero plus | superaque parens.|
septem me naatam | annorum gremio | ipse recepit;
(quadraginta) | annos nata necis potior.|
ille meo officio adsiduo florebat ad omnis;

at the left, under a man's name:

[h]aec quae me faato praecessit, corpore | casto |
[c]oniunxs, una meo praedita amans | animo,|
[f]ido fida viro veixsit, | studio parili qum |
nulla in avaritie | cessit ab officio.[117]

The actual dialogues are very brief, as C. I. L. III, 2722=9729 (Büch. 1536):

hunc titulum posuit tibi fidus amicus:
ultuma | quae potui debita pers[o]lvi.|

non dolere, mater: faciundum fuit.
properavit | aetas, voluit hoc astrum meum.
vale et priores | aetate te tollant hunc luctum tibi.

See also VI, 22102 (Büch. 92), and the Greek inscription, VI, 35361 (Kaibel, I. G. I. 1514 a, 4th cent.). The one exception contains two dialogues, one of the dead and the wayfarer, the other of the living and dead, in speeches of some length (C. I. L. VI, 12652, Kaibel, Ep. 582, Büch. 995, Tiberius).

There are certain curiosities in sepulchral poetry which must be briefly noticed before entering on a discussion of the origin of all these classes of poems. Occasionally the name of the person honored by the epitaph is purposely obscured. The most striking instance of this is an African inscription, found in Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 24 (1894), p. 421, no. 90 (Büch. 1331), which definitely refuses to state the name and years, so as not to burden the reader with lasting grief. Twice the name is hinted at, once by noting that it is that of the first month, Ianuarius (C. I. L. X, 4183, Büch. 222, very late), the other time by the statement that it is the 'precious green gem,' Smaragdus (C. I. L. XIV, 1821, Büch. 563). But the most usual style is the acrostic. This is a later invention not earlier than the second century; it meets with special favor at Rome and in Africa, and is long continued in Christian usage.[118] A good instance has already been cited in another connection (see p. 251).

Further, there are extant three epitaphs of pet dogs. On one the animal itself speaks (C. I. L. VI, 29896, Büch. 1175), on the others the person bereaved (C. I. L. X, 659, Büch. 1176, XIII, 488, Büch. 1512, 2d-3d cent.). These are modeled on the sepulchral inscriptions of people; at the same time they show to a slight extent the influence

of the famous verses on similar subjects in Catullus (3), Martial (1, 109) and Ovid (Amores 2, 6).

The authorship of all this poetry seems not difficult to determine. Several times the person erecting the monument expressly states that he composed the verses, as in C. I. L. VI, 28753 (Büch. 108), *Trebius Basileus coniunx quae scripsi dolens;*[119] considering the general lack of merit in the productions, there is no good cause to doubt, as Tolkiehn has done (cf. note 40), that these people are telling the truth. The quasi-metrical inscriptions generally called "commatic," which give only hints and fragments of metre, are also surely "home-made," patched up from pieces gathered from every quarter (see Büch. 1563-1622, some impersonal; A. J. A. Second Series, vol. 2 (1898), p. 396, no. 60). It is a natural inference too that, where the person named on the stone is a poet or rhetorician, he wrote his own poetic epitaph.[120] For the others, the theory of Lier is no more valid here than in the case of the formulae. The only early poetic *eulogium* of a man of rank is that of Scipio (see p. 252), and it had no direct influence on later inscriptions, as far as can be seen. On the other hand, several facts tend to confirm the assumption that these poems were the work of craftsmen who were both stone-cutters and poetasters, like Hawthorne's Mr. Wigglesworth. These facts are: the comparatively narrow range of ideas and the fewness of the poetic types; the joining of Greek epigrams to Latin prose; the use of "tags" from the classic poets, the repetition of similar "tags" from other sepulchral poems, and the occasional borrowing of a line (see Büch. *passim,* C. Hose in Rhein. Mus., vol. 50 (1895), p. 286 ff., Lier, *l. c.*); and the very existence of repeated formulae. All this would indicate, if there were no other evidence, the work of craftsmen who had accumulated a large stock-in-trade of commonplaces. But there are two lines of positive

epigraphic evidence which make this hypothesis a certainty. We have namely the expressions *ordinantur et sculpuntur,* τυποῦνται καὶ χαράσσονται, and *titulos scribendos* on the advertisements mentioned above (p. 241); and besides this, the definite addition of the poet's *scripsi(t)* in C. I. L. XIV, 3415 (Büch. 746, Christian, 4th cent.), Kraus, 38 (Büch. 321), where clearly no member of the family is intended.

The question of the source of all the ideas and forms of expression used by these poetasters must be briefly noticed, though rather outside the limits of the matter in hand. Kaibel (in Hermes, vol. 35, 1900, p. 567 ff.) and Lier (*l. c.* p. 449) have noted that certain of the Latin *sententiae* are apparently translations of epigrams in the Greek Anthology. Accepting this suggestion and starting from the theory that we have already criticized, Lier has tried to indicate how the contents of Latin poetic epitaphs were derived from Greek epitaphs, whence, or from the Greek prose "consolations," they also drew their form; he maintains further that one can never assume that a Greek poetic inscription, however late, was copied from a Latin one. This last statement is clearly open to objection, since in their prose inscriptions the Greeks borrowed even the Roman formulae, which are found in most of the Greek epitaphs from Italy as well as supposedly original Greek poetry. Further, the parallels Lier brings forward are not at all convincing; they form a curious jumble of early and late times, of famous and obscure authors, and can always be offset by Latin instances. Even the supposed translations from the Anthology look doubtful, as the poets cited are all minor and even obscure, and where the exact translation is sure (Büch. 1498, Anth. 9, 49), the author of the Greek epigram is unknown. It seems much more probable that the thoughts expressed as well as the forms of expression were to some extent suggested by the Latin poets, at least

for the thousand odd sepulchral poems written entirely in Latin; but that after all such thoughts are really commonplaces, peculiar to no time or country, and were thus part of the popular consciousness by the time the majority of these poems were composed.

The number of inscriptions containing autobiographic elements outside of the dedications and epitaphs is relatively small; but many of these are important, and among them are some of the purest autobiographic productions.

The honorary inscriptions, however, introduce autobiographic elements into the conventional form but once, C. I. L. VIII, 5367. In the five other instances (C. I. L. II, 1174, Antonines, 4514, end 2d cent., V, 1978, VIII, 1641, 175-180 A. D., X, 107) the first person is found in citations, not definitely so marked, from wills or other documents, giving money to a municipality or college for certain purposes, as the care of poor children and the celebration of birthdays. Similar citations are found in certain sepulchral inscriptions already discussed (see p. 246); but there of course the purpose of the inscription is entirely different.

Of special interest are the "autobiographic records." These have one definite aim, in spite of their varied content; they are bare statements of something done, with no purpose except to give information which reflects credit on the persons named. Several, both pagan and Christian, give details regarding the construction of public and private works;[121] two are records on stone of requests and the granting of them, one for the transfer of bodies to a tomb (C. I. L. VI, 2120, 155 A. D.), the other for burials on a certain estate (VI, 10242, 136 A. D.). Another series from Salonae (C. I. L. III, 1967, of 302 and 316 A. D., 1968, of 303, 319, 320 A. D., 8690) mentions the performance of a religious duty in a *collegium*. To this class further belong two interesting Imperial poems, one, C. I. L. VI, 1207

(Büch. 895) probably from a triumphal arch of uncertain date, the other, Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 55, no. 11 (Büch. 902), telling of the recovery of Constantine from a bad illness. Finally, there are the two most important documents of all. The one, C. I. L. VIII, 2728, of about 152 A. D,. relates in interesting detail the engineering feat of a Nonius Datus, a *librator* of the third legion in Africa, in straightening out a mistake in the building of an aqueduct, adding a letter of praise written by his superior. The other, our earliest prose autobiography, C. I. L. I, 551 = X, 6950, of 132 B. C., is called the milestone of Publius Popilius; this is a real autobiography. It reads:

viam fecei ab Regio ad Capuam et | in ea via ponteis omneis miliarios | tabelariosque poseivei. Hince sunt Nouceriam meilia LI, Capuam XXCIIII, | Valentiam CLXXX/, ad fretum ad | statuam CCXXXI/, Regium CCXXXVII; | suma af Capua Regium meilia CCCXXI/. | et eidem praetor in | Sicilia fugiteivos Italicorum | conquaeisivei redideique | homines DCCCCXVII, eidemque | primus fecei ut de agro poplico | aratoribus cederent paastores. | Forum aedisque poplicas heic fecei.

From Tacitus (Agricola 1) we learn that celebrated men in early times wrote autobiographies, and the literary references are copious: but here on the enduring stone is a true autobiography which antedates by fully twenty years any literary autobiography recorded, the earliest one given being of a consul of 115 B. C.

In this class of "autobiographic records" we may place the Monumentum Ancyranum. The present generally accepted view seems to be that it was sepulchral;[122] and certainly, after working through the material gathered above, one cannot accept the objections made to this view, as by O. Hirschfeld (Wiener Studien, vol. 7 (1885), p. 171), on the grounds of the unusual form, except the possible omission of the name of Augustus at the beginning or end. But

why not call it by the name which is suggested by Suetonius (Augustus 101) and Dio Cassius (56, 33), and in the present superscription, all of which reflect the light in which the Emperor himself must have viewed it, an *index rerum a se (me) gestarum?* It thus becomes simply an autobiographic account of those events of the Emperor's reign which he wished to have remembered, supplementing his earlier literary memoirs, which he placed before his tomb on bronze tablets, as Popilius one hundred and fifty years before had written out his humbler account and placed it by the roadside in a similarly conspicuous position.

Closely allied to the autobiographic records of a public character are private business records which contain autobiographic elements. Most of them, however, use conventional expressions. These formulae, as given in the Pompeian wax tablets, are two: *scripsi me accepisse,* of the person himself,[123] and *scripsi rogatu* (or *mandatu*), of the slave charged with writing the receipt.[124] Both of these formulae are found elsewhere as well: the first occurs even earlier on a tile from the country of the Frentani (C. I. L. IX, 6312, 19 A. D.), the second on later wax tablets from Dacia (C. I. L. III, pp. 948-9, nos. IX, 163 A. D., X, 164 A. D., XI), and in a Christian inscription from Rome (Bull. Crist. Second Series, vol. 5 (1874), p. 11). Further than these there are only two similar business documents, also written in formal business language. One, C. I. L. VI, 29791, assigns certain buildings to a daughter, the other, set in a house, C. I. L. X, 866, states *M(arco) Tofelano* | *M(arci) f(ilio)* | *Valenti, quod* | *amico donavi* | *(sestertio) n(ummi) (uno),* a sum corresponding to our "one dollar and other valuable considerations."

Fully as stereotyped are the autobiographic inscriptions, other than *graffiti,* found on small objects of use and luxury.

Most important are the makers' marks, which resemble certain sepulchral inscriptions in merely having the name with *feci* instead of the name with *fecit,* the more common form. These hardly occur in Rome (C. I. L. XV, 311 is doubtful: but cf. XV, 7224, a glass plaque); they are characteristic of pottery from Gaul, Germany and Britain,[125] and their presence on other objects, as a mosaic from Pompeii (C. I. L. X, 8146) and a lead pipe from Aricia (C. I. L. XIV, 2175), is unique. The other inscriptions, with autobiographic elements on small objects are descriptive; only two kinds are worth mentioning. First are those on tags attached to collars of slaves. These are mere labels, designed to prevent the loss of this valuable property; the slave himself speaks, telling the reader, "I am X's slave, hold, take me back to X," giving the master's address.[126] And second, of two consular diptychs, one, found in three examples, C. I. L. V, 8120[3], XIII, 10032[7] (Büch. 898, 521 A. D.?), bears a Latin distich, *munera par* | *va quidem pre* | *tio sed hono* | *ribus alma* | *patribus* | *ista meis offe* | *ro cons(ul) ego,* the other, found in three examples, V, 8120,[4] XIII, 10032[8] (Kaibel, Ep. 1119 a, 525 A. D.), a Greek distich of similar import.

The inscriptions thus far discussed may be classed as formal; that is, they are all written with some care on a separate object having a space prepared for receiving the inscription, and they are all written with a definite aim, as dedication, eulogy of the dead, or a mere designation of the purpose of an object, and with a view to permanence. The remaining inscriptions, consisting of *graffiti* from Pompeii and elsewhere, are of a different type. In form they are mere scratchings on something not originally intended to receive them, as a wall; in content they approach some of the formal inscriptions, being records of some event, but

they are usually chance expressions of the writer, of a transitory nature.

Two classes of these scratchings in particular are more stereotyped in form than the others and record events much like the more elaborate autobiographic records. The larger class consists of the notices left by sightseers in Egypt. For the most part they are the work of soldiers, and accurately dated. The famous statue of Memnon is covered with such statements by those who heard what they supposed to be its voice. Usually we have the man's name and rank, the date and a simple statement like *audi Memnonem,* as in C. I. L. III, 36, of 84 A. D., *Sex(tus) Licinius Pudens (centurio) leg(ionis) XXII,* | *XI K(alendas) I(anuarias) anno (quarto) imp(eratoris)* | *Domitiani Caesaris Augusti* | *Germanici, audi Memnonem.*[127] Thrice, however, C. I. L. III, 47 (Büch. 227, 136 A. D.), 55 (Büch. 272, Hadrian-Severus), 45 (Büch. 880, 134 A. D.), the visitors are inspired to poetic efforts: the last-named poem runs:

> horam cum primam cumque | horam sole secundam
> prolata Oceano luminat | alma dies,|
> vox audita mihi est ter bene | Memnonia.

Similar notices of visits occur elsewhere in Egypt;[128] especially noteworthy is the following poem. cut on one of the Pyramids (C. I. L. III, 21, Büch. 270, 102-117 A. D.):

> vidi pyramidas sine te, dulcissime frater,
> et tibi quod potui lacrimas hic m[a]esta profudi
> et nostri memorem luctus hanc sculpo querelam.
> sit nomen Decimi [G]entia[n]i pyramide alta
> pontificis comitisque tuis, Traiane, triumphis
> lustra[que] sex intra censoris consulis exs[tet](?).

The other class comprises the *graffiti* on the walls of the barracks of the *vigiles* at Rome and Ostia. They preserve the notice of certain duties the men have performed, with pious ejaculations; like the other class, they are somewhat

stereotyped, but full and carefully dated. For example, C. I. L. VI, 3005, of 227 A. D., says: *Octavius Felix mi-l(es) coh(ortis) (septimae) | vigi(lum) Severianes c(enturiae) Maximi | sebaciaria feci Albino (iterum) | Maximo co(n)-s(ulibus) mes(e) Octobr(i) | feliciter.*[129]

All the other *graffiti* are very irregular in form and thought. The prose statements are a queer mixture, and show how perfectly casual these interesting personal expressions are. There are simple notices that the person named has been present, as C. I. L. IV, 3088, 1481, 3919, accounts of repairs to shoes, C. I. L. IV, 1711, 1712, amounts won at dice, C. I. L. IV, 2119, and even a laundry list, C. I. L. IV, 816 (cf. also IV, 1698, 6873). Greetings and wishes, the latter not always complimentary, are quite frequent;[130] in one case (C. I. L. XIII, 3139=1188, cf. IV, 1684) there is even a fragmentary letter preserved. The phrase ordinarily used in election notices, *oro vos facialis,* usually abbreviated, has been included above (p. 217) in the pseudo-autobiographic appeals from Pompeii, as it has no real personal force: but occasionally, as in C. I. L. IV, 423, *G(aium) Calventium | Sittium (duo)v(irum) i(ure) d(i-cundo): | ego | Astylus sum* (see also 2975, 3712, 6625, 6678, 6902), the recommendations do take on a personal tone. Finally, once in a tomb a dialogue is given between the dead and the living (C. I. L. X, 2641).

The poetry found is for the most part erotic. Some lines are repeated several times, as C. I. L. IV, 1520 (Büch. 354), parts of which are found in 1523, 1526, 1528, 3040:

> Candida me docuit nigras | odisse puellas.
> odero, s[i] potero, sed non, invitus | amabo.[131]
>
> Ovid, Amor. 3, 11, 35.

Occasionally some idler airs his personal opinions in the form of a *sententia.* Such is C. I. L. IV, 1880 (Büch.

933), *L(uci) Istacidi. at quem non ceno barbarus ille mihi est.* (See also 4971, Büch. 935; 5112, Büch. 1491.)

The Romans, as already known from the literature, possessed the autobiographic feeling in an unusual degree. This is manifested in the inscriptions earlier than in any known literary autobiography. In the inscriptions, moreover, it is exhibited with the widest possible latitude, but it finds fullest expression among the lower orders of society. In the religious dedications and the sepulchral inscriptions, which are dedicatory in form, the conventions always present in epigraphic types and religious conservatism tend to restrict the expression of autobiographic feeling, resulting in a variation between personal and impersonal expressions and the development of an autobiographic formula. Yet, especially among the unlettered, the feeling breaks through artificial barriers. When the lower classes wish to employ autobiographic elements, they find themselves capable of only a few commonplace ideas, and apply to the professional stone-cutters and poetasters for the literary forms, which thus tend to become stereotyped: but in many cases the expressions used are quite individual. Thus in numerous inscriptions the autobiographic feeling is present, though frequently curbed; and, from the Monumentum Ancyranum to the hasty scrawls of idlers, it forms a characteristic and interesting element of the Roman epigraphic records.

APPENDIX A.

1. See West, Roman Autobiography, particularly Augustine's Confessions, 1901. Misch, Geschichte der Autobiographie, Erster Band: Das Altertum, Leipzig, 1907, is inclined to make autobiography a Hellenistic product, despite the lack of evidence. See especially, pp. 105, 118, 121, 122, 124.

2. Peck, The Personal Element in Roman Epitaphs, A. J. A. Second Series, vol. 7, (1903), pp. 88-9. Misch, *op. cit.*, p. 108, note 2, mentions the need of a special treatment of inscriptions.

3. 39 certain examples in Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca.

4. Other examples are:

1) C. I. L. IV, 1635, 1805, 1904 = 2461 = 2487 (Bücheler, Carmina Latina Epigraphica 957), 2167, 2373, 3882, 4562, 5195, 6697, from Pompeii; C. I. L. III, 11411, Steinamanger (ancient Savaria), V, Suppl. Ital. 417 (Büch. 922), Concordia, XI, 6690^{8}, Roncopascolo.

2) C. I. L. IV, 1074, 1121, 1322, 1937, 2310 k = Aen. 9, 404, 1645 (Büch. 953), 1781, from Pompeii; C. I. L. III, 13541, St. Pölten, XIV, 3696, Tivoli; Acad. Inscrip. et Belles-Let. Comptes-Rendus, 1903, p. 344, El-Mergeb, Africa; Bull. Crist. Fourth Series, vol. 3 (1884-5), p. 54, Krasrîn (ancient Cillium); Büch. 1798, Rome.

3) C. I. L. IV, 1597 = 1766 (Büch. 38), 1791, 3061, 5296 (Büch. 950), 6892.

5. C. I. L. II, 4969^{3}, VIII, 22644^{4}, IX, 6081^{1}, X, 8053^{5}, XI, 6699^{6}, XIII, $10001^{5,6}$, XV, 6196-8, 6200, 6201; Suppl. Ital. $1079^{48a,b}$.

6. C. I. L. VIII, 22634^{3}, XI, 6710^{17}, XII, $5687^{34,46}$, XIII, 10001^{12}, various numbers under 10018, 10024; XV, 6210, 6220; Bull. Crist. vol. 1 (1863), pp. 31, 33 ff.; Bull. Arch. 1907, p. CCIII, also p. 289, no. 6.

7. C. I. L. III, 6009^{2}, 12013^{3} (with a *sententia*), X, 8056^{4}, various numbers under XIII, 10018; cf. XIII, 10024^{134}, on a ring.

8. C. I. L. III, 6009[1], XII, 5687[38], XIII, various numbers under 10012, 10013, 10018, 10025.

9. C. I. L. III, 6019[12], VII, 1306, XI, 6711[3], 6716[118], XII, 5692[6], 5693[8b, 9], 5698[18], XIII, various numbers under 10024, 10027.

10. Pagan: C. I. L. IV, 3442, 3494, 4123 a, 4133, VI, 10205 b, VIII, 8509 (Büch. 883), 10889, 21510 (Büch. 295), X, 878, 880, XIV, 2028.

Christian: C. I. L. XIII, 3062; Bull. Crist. Fourth Series, vol. 1 (1882), plates III-VI; Comptes-Rendus, 1900, pp. 48-9.

On an inscription (IX, 2689) an entire dialogue is given illustrating a relief below.

11. C. I. L. III, 2673 (Ps. 42, 1), VIII, 11133 (cf. 2 Cor. 12, 2-3), 11269 (Ps. 39, 12), XI, 257 a (Ps. 23, 2), 261 (John 14, 6), 276 g (Ps. 68, 28-9).

Similar quotations are found on a ring, C. I. L. XII, 5692[14] (Ps. 118, 16) and seals, Bull. Crist. Third Series, vol. 4 (1879), p. 165, *auget mi deus* and C. I. L. XIII, 10035[2] (Ps. 116, 13); cf. Bull. Crist. Fifth Series, vol. 4 (1893-4), pp. 97-9.

12. Here may be noted other single words on various objects, as C. I. L. VII, 1338[6], *dedico,* IX, 6090[1], *peredi,* XI, 6712[497], *utor,* XII, 5690[136], *vincamus,* XV, 6234, *lugeo;* Eph. Epigr. vol. 7, p. 346, no. 1150, *ibimus.*

13. Other examples are: C. I. L. VI, 7574 (Büch. 1490), 15258 (Büch. 1499), 19055 (Büch. 495), 25580 (Büch. 94), 27788 (Büch. 1488), VII, 759 (Büch. 24), VIII, 20758 (Büch. 518), IX, 3128 (Büch. 184), XI, 3273 (recent?).

14. Cf. also C. I. L. VIII, 10694 and 18669, 10705, 10905, 11643.

15. C. I. L. VIII, 2218 and X, 15 (Rom. 8, 31), 8622 (Ps. 12, 4), 8623-4 (Ps. 30, 2), 8625 (Ps. 116, 13), 17610 (cf. Rom. 8, 31), 18742 (Hebr. 13, 6, Ps. 118, 6); Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 424, no. 45 (Ps. 26, 8); Kraus 72 (1 Kings 12, 23); Inscr. Hisp. Christ. 95 and inscriptions cited in Rev. Arch. Second Series, vol. 2 (1860), p. 40 (Job 19, 25-6); Comptes-Rendus, 1907, p. x (Ps. 32, 11, 56, 41).

16. See also C. I. L. V, 6723 (Büch. 704), VI, 23090, XIV, 2566; Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 32, no. 77 (Büch. 306),

p. 64, no. 15, p. 71, no. 42, p. 83, no. 26 (Büch. 787), p. 108, no. 59, p. 274, nos. 4 and 4a, p. 275, nos. 8-10, p. 279, no. 1.

17. C. I. L. VI, 459, 598, 605, 623, 1833 a, 1967, 7299, etc.; XII, 3050-3056, 3063-6, 3081.

18. On the general subject of Imperial titles, especially the earliest appearance of *dominus*, see Mommsen, Staatsrecht II³, p. 760 ff., Christoph Schoener, Ueber die Titulaturen der römischen Kaiser, in Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis, vol. 2 (1881), p. 449 ff.

19. Cf. Schoener, *l. c.*

20. As C. I. L. VI, 1665, X, 6850, XV, 1663-1671, 1673-5; Inscr. Hisp. Christ. 76, 573 A. D., 155, 587 A. D. .

21. C. I. L. XII, 4312, 5341-5, XIII, 1108, 1487, 1511, 1513, 1529, 1532-3.

22. C. I. L. III, 12030¹, VI, 1200, VIII, 10529; VIII, 10681.

23. In late times one instance of *d n* with *Papa n* occurs at Ravenna (C. I. L. XI, 285, 570-578 A. D.). This phrase is of course common as referring to God and Christ, as are also *deus noster* and *salvator noster*.

24. C. I. L. III, 12043, 12044 = 13569, 12133, all of Constantine, 459 = 14199², of Julian, 362 A. D.

25. C. I. L. III, 6998, Hadrian, VI, 10233, 211 A. D., 10239, 10245, 10247, 252 A. D., 14027, VIII, 9052, ca. 235 A. D., IX, 449, X, 114, 7457, 175 A. D., XI, 6520, Trajan; Not. d. Scav. 1894, p. 20 ff., Ant. Pius; cf. C. I. L. X, 6419, a Christian document.

The will of L. Dasumius Tuscus (VI, 10229, 108 A. D.) occurs alone, properly labeled, also a fragmentary will of about the time of Trajan (C. I. L. XIII, 5708).

26. See also C. I. L. I, 1008 = VI, 25369 (Büch. 59), IV, 5007 (= 3299, 3300), V, 4905 (Büch. 982), 5870 (Büch. 807), 7047, VI, 10220, 25861, X, 5099 (Büch. 1480); Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 39 (1901), p. 448, no. 115; cf. C. I. L. X, 2752 (Büch. 1053).

27. C. I. L. XV, 5925-6, 5928, 5930, 6122, 6158, 6159; XIV, 4184 a, Nemi.

28. C. I. G. 8337, on a lecythus, 32, on a bronze basin, both from Cumae; I. G. A. 526, a patera, provenience un-

known. Similar inscriptions on many small objects are found all over the Greek world, some dating from as early as the 7th century.

29. See Helbig, Führer, Zweite Auflage (1899), pp. 432, 437.

30. C. I. L. IV, 2776, X, $8055^{14, 58}$, from Pompeii; III, 6009^{3}, Vienna Museum, 12642, Dacia; XIII, 10016^{4}, various numbers under 10018, XV, 4542 = XII, p. 843. Cf. inscr. on bronze tessera in Rev. Arch. Fourth Series, vol. 9 (1907), p. 360, no. 108, Trêves.

31. C. I. L. V, 7781 (Büch. 893, ca. 353 A. D.), X, 7017 (Kaibel, Ep. 599, 3d-4th cent.), III, 737 (Büch. 286, 390 A. D.), 6306 = 8153 (Büch. 273, Alex. Severus), III, 5317, end 2d cent. Cf. also Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 274, no. 4b.

32. C. I. L. VI, 520 (Kaibel, Ep. 816, Büch. 1528), 3708 (Büch. 193, 'best period'), 31051 (Büch. 269, 'poor letters').

33. C. I. L. I, 1007 = VI, 15346 (Büch. 52, Gracchi), 1306 = IX, 4933 (Büch. 54, ca. Sulla), V, 8974 (Büch. 214), VIII, 5370 (Büch. 112).

34. C. I. L. VI, 18086 (commatic, Büch. 1581), 28695 (Büch. 1145), 36537, 2d cent., X, 4352, ca. Augustus.

35. Cf. for prose inscriptions C. I. G. 8, 39, C. I. A. I, 466, 475, I. G. A. 132, 336, 358, 378, 387, 408, 446-7, 449, 540, Kirch.^{4} 33, Roberts, 163 a, and especially I. G. A. 528, 536, from the Chalcidian colonies: and for poetic inscriptions, Kaibel, Ep. 11, 19, 86, 181, 188, 472, sepulchral; 739, 752, 756, 778, 843, 858, 926, 1097, dedications.

36. C. I. L. III, 423 (Büch. 1168), 13656, Flavians?, 14179, Ant. Pius, 14184^{9}, after Caracalla, 14188, 4th cent.

37. C. I. L. III, 1617, 5th cent., 4293, 3d cent., 10453, 3d cent.; Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 14 (1889), p. 169, no. 116, late Chr.

In a Roman inscription of the 5th-6th cent. we have *ego Deusdet . . . botum fecit* (Bull. Crist. Second Series, vol. 1 (1870), p. 33 ff.).

38. Other examples are C. I. L. V, 6506, VI, 19, 3d cent., XIV, 2850, Antonines.

39. The others are C. I. L. VII, 80, on a silver plate, VIII, 620 = 11796, 21567, 174 A. D., XIII, 5042 ('letters not good').

40. Compare remarks of Tolkiehn, Die inscriftliche Poesie der Römer, in Neue Jahrb. f. Klass. Alt. u. Paed. vol. 7 (1901), pp. 169, 170.

41. The following are among the more interesting dedicatory poems containing autobiographic elements: C. I. L. V, 5049 (Büch. 417, 1st cent.), 6876 (Büch. 873), VI, 312 (Büch. 868, consul of 193, 204 A. D.), 316 (Büch. 869, 3d-4th cent.), VIII, 2662 (Büch. 252, ca. 226 A. D.), IX, 3375 (Büch. 250, 156 A. D.), X, 3336 (Kaibel, Ep. 838, 238-244 A. D.), 3796 (Büch. 256, 4th cent.), XI, 5262 (Büch. *1800, ca. Hadrian), XII, 103 (Büch. 19, end 2d cent.), 2926 (Büch. 863, beg. 1st cent.), XIII, 581 (Büch. 871), 7661 (Büch. 850, Kaibel, I. G. I. 2562), XIV, 1 (Büch. 251, consul II, 216 A. D.), 2852 (Büch. 249, 136 A. D.).

42. Cf. Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 102, no. 25, p. 136, no. 11, with the Damasan poem on p. 190, no. 3; note also p. 64, no. 12, and p. 134, no. 5, Damasan, p. 110, no. 67 (Büch. 912, 432-440 A. D.), and Bull. Crist., Fourth Series, vol. 3 (1884-5), pp. 30, 31.

43. C. I. L. I, 818 (= VI, 140), VIII, 12505, Carthage, X, 3824, Capua, 8249, near Minturnae, XIII, 7550, Kreuznach, 7554, 7555, II, III, Worms Museum; Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 41 (1902), p. 348, no. 57, Hadrumetum, vol. 35 (1899), p. 191, no. 105, Carthage, vol. 39 (1901), p. 468 ff., nos. 183-4, Mentana, vol. 25 (1894), p. 388, no. 113, Cumae; Eph. Epigr. vol. 8, p. 58, no. 238 (doubtful).

44. Other examples are: C. I. L. VIII, 12504, Carthage, cf. 12508-12511, similar Greek; Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 21 (1893), p. 258, no. 27, Fourth Series, vol. 9 (1907), p. 352, no. 68, Hadrumetum.

45. This is the theory of Wachsmuth, in Rhein. Mus. vol. 18 (1863), p. 566, where on the preceding pages he collected the Greek and Latin instances then known; see also Roscher, Ausführliches Lexikon der gr. u. röm. Mythologie, vol. II, 1, 257-9. Our earliest example, cited on p. 229, bears this out completely.

46. Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 16 (1890), p. 449, no. 158, Fourth Series, vol. 2 (1903), p. 175, no. 210.

47. Ann. Inst. 1846, pp. 214-217, Sitzb. bayer. Akad. 1870, vol. I, p. 522 ff.; see also Bull. Crist., vol. 7 (1869), p. 61. The date is the fourth or early fifth century.

48. See Roscher, 2317, C. I. L. VI, p. 2900. The extent to which the *dis manibus* form was used is best given by Huebner, Müller's Handbuch, vol. I, pp. 687-9.

49. See C. I. L. I, 1063, 1065 = VI, 5639, 1024 = VI, 11452, VI, 27903, 33423.

50. *E. g.* C. I. L. VIII, 21801, after 419 A. D., XI, 3238, 400 or 405 A. D., XII, 1497, 470 A. D., XIII, 3033, ca. 400 A. D.?, 3052, do.

51. The proportion, excluding Christian inscriptions, is approximately two to one.

Notice similar variations in Greek inscriptions, as C. I. L. III, 14179, Antonines, VI, 7705, after Flavians, 10091, Severus.

52. I have noticed only C. I. L. VI, 2496 = 32650, 28063, IX, 5478, 2d cent., XIII, 1880, after 87 A. D.; cf. XIII, 3691 = Kraus 96, 4th cent.

53. *E. g.* C. I. L. V, 8734, 8736, 8772, all of beg. 5th cent., Inscr. Christ. I, 584, 408 A. D.

In VI, 2705, XII, 5385, *militavi* similarly occurs for *militavit*.

Corresponding Greek forms are found in the Cemetery of Priscilla; see Bull. Crist. Fifth Series, vol. 3 (1892), p. 79, no. 330.

54. As C. I. L. III, 10232-3, 4th cent.; V, 1685 and 8587, of the same man, 4th cent. The other instances, exclusive of those cited in 55, are: C. I. L. V, 1691, 6207, VI, 3405, 3d cent., 31984, 35868, 4th cent.?, VIII, 20718, IX, 2081, X, 7173, XI, 3756, beg. 4th cent., XIII, 7643; Inscr. Christ. I, 221, 371 A. D., 883, 483 A. D.; Nuovo Bull. Crist. vol. 10 (1904), p. 83, no. 5, 380 A. D., p. 106, 4th cent.; Bull. Arch. 1901, p. CCXXXVI.

55. C. I. L. V, 8765, 8988 c, Not. d. Scav. 1886, p. 110, 1890, p. 171, all of beg. 5th cent.

56. C. I. L. III, 4938, 3d cent.?, V, 3395, 5678, XIII, 1844, 2d cent., are *mihi carissima;* others are C. I. L. II, 5677, VI, 9375, 10281, 13293, Aurelius or Caracalla-Elagabalus, 16613 (=XI, 6142, Büch. 165), 20116, ca. 98

A. D., 21848, 22084, X, 2956, XIII, 1897 (ca. 2d cent.), 1920, 2238; Inscr. Christ. I, 53, 339 A. D., 134, 358 A. D., 411, 393 A. D., 425, 395 A. D.; Bull. Crist. vol. 1 (1863), p. 82.

57. Cf. with C. I. L. VI, 5767, 12871, 20450, 26467 a, 29054, C. I. L. VI, 15126; with XIII, 2087 (end 2d cent.), XIII, 2205 ('good letters'). In VI, 22848 the person is uncertain, owing to abbreviations.

58. Note C. I. L. V, 6388, VI, 8628, Domitian, 9438, ca. Augustus, 19100, 20153, ca. Augustus, 25184, 27257 (Büch. 162).

59. There are portions of similar phrases in C. I. L. VI, 17408, 19000, 19883, 27196, X, 8192, Augustan?.

60. See C. I. L. V, 4927, VI, 8054, ca. Tiberius, 24938, 26891, 27866, X, 168, XII, 729, XIV, 2841; III, 14855, IX, 384 and X, 8189 are later.

61. Such are C. I. L. III, 9451, V, 4582, 4927, VI, 8054, 22066, 24938, 26891, 27866, X, 168 and XII, 729, III, 14855, IX, 384 and X, 8189, X, 1760, V, 3627 and X, 5745 (Büch. 176), XIV, 2841, Not. d. Scav. 1891, p. 97 = 1894, p. 252.

62. See also C. I. L. V, 1997, 4370, 4th cent., VIII, 9164; cf. the Greek in XI, 3030, and the greeting in VI, 10268, 3d-4th cent.

63. This seems to have been a favorite military form: C. I. L. III, 5949, 4th cent., 5957, after 166-170 A. D., 6131 = 7454, 11076, 13373; C. I. L. III, 11049, 11050, 3d cent., VI, 13891 = 10654, Not. d. Scav. 1902, p. 383, are non-military. Cf. for other like phrases C. I. L. III, 4263, VIII, 7384, XIII, 8100, XIV, 2348.

64. Cf. also C. I. L. VIII, 9473 (Büch. 1153) and 21349 (frag.), both from ancient Caesarea; VIII, 5834 and 5804 (Büch. 635-6), corruptions of a common source, both from ancient Sigus.

65. C. I. L. VIII, 9713 a, b, 9751-2, 21635, 21637, 21639, 21642, 21645, 21675, Bull. Arch. 1899, p. 459, no. 10; note, however, Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 444, no. 185, from Rome.

66. Cf. also Bull. Crist. Fifth Series, vol. 1 (1890), p. 144, vol. 4 (1893-4), p. 145. Similar Gk. in Nuovo Bull.

Crist., vol. 7 (1901), p. 270. Note also Bull. Crist. Fourth Series, vol. 4 (1886), p. 106, no. 167, Fifth Series, vol. 3 (1892), p. 114, no. 31; Comptes-Rendus, 1907, p. xv, Dougga. In Bull. Arch. 1907, p. CCXLIII, we have a Christian inscr. of 4th-5th cent. from Africa, quoting Aen. 11, 97-8.

67. See Bull. Crist. Second Series, vol. 6 (1875), pp. 28-30. Note, however, an example of beg. 4th cent. in Bull. Crist. Fifth Series, vol. 4 (1893-4), p. 58 = Not. d. Scav. 1893, p. 119; and Bull. Arch. 1907, pp. CCLXV-VI, Dougga.

68. See C. I. L. VI, 13484, 16395, X, 2766, 4294; VI, 7474, 8450 a, Tib.-Claud., 19316; VI, 24598, 33846, 14823, X, 2878; VI, 8456, Trajan, 29383, 35595, XIV, 1452; VI, 18104, X, 3037, Not. d. Scav. 1899, p. 148, Sulmona, frag.; VI, 8489, 9258, 21699, 22484, 25796 = 34164, 1st cent., 34794, XIV, 3323, 4th cent.

69. *E. g.* C. I. L. VI, 1825, 9485, 10219, bef. Caracalla, 13785, 15080, 17618, 19915, 21925, Titus or later, 22208, 26940. *veto* precedes in 17549.

70. C. I. L. VI, 21096, 27977, XIV, 1644; a similar phrase in 13040, Aurelius and Verus; doubtful abbreviations in X, 2275, 2614.

71. See also C. I. L. V, 8738; Bull. Crist. Second Series, vol. 5 (1874), p. 137 ff.

72. In C. I. L. VI, 10173 and 19882, cited on p. 237, a more personal form occurs, also in III, 2098, from Salonae.

73. See C. I. L. VI, 5886, 12802, early Empire, 13927, 18281, XII, 4725, 1st cent., XIV, 2535.

74. See C. I. L. III, 3403 and VI, 10458, 36467, IX, 5813; also XI, 322, 325, a like Chr. form later than the 6th cent.

75. As in C. I. L. II, 369, 540, 1229, 1699, 1728, 1853, 2567 and 5241 (Büch. 1452), 3186, 3296, VI, 17768 (cf. Büch. 1456), VIII, 4504 = 18642, Lambaesis; Eph. Epigr. vol. 8, p. 386, no. 90, Spain, partly abbreviated. Cf. Büch. 1452-6. A fuller form from Lambaesis is found in C. I. L. VIII, 3727, 4120 (Büch. 133, 3d cent.).

76. See also C. I. L. II, 958, 1099, 1752, 1837, 2854, 5419, VIII, 9496 (Büch. 1455), Suppl. Ital. 995.

77. See C. I. L. X, 3312, 6th cent.?, 4525 and 4530, 7th cent. or later, XI, 324, after 6th cent., XIII, 3511 and

3515, end of 7th cent., XIV, 3420, 542-565 A. D.; Nuovo Bull. Crist. vol. 4 (1898), p. 175; Comptes-Rendus, 1908, pp. 140-141, Malta, 5th cent.

78. As C. I. L. III, 8177, after Trajan, VI, 11938, 16043, XI, 1483, XIV, 1169; cf., however, VI, 21848. A similar phrase occurs in VIII, 9069, of 320 A. D.

79. As in C. I. L. II, 1434, V, 1939 = XI, 6545, commatic (Büch. 1585), VI, 9258, X, 2070, XIII, 530, 2d cent.; Rev. Arch. vol. 19 (1892), p. 295, no. 15, African. An abbreviated form in C. I. L. V, 2893. See Büch. 247 and Kaibel, Ep. 1117a.

80. C. I. L. VI, 25617 (Büch. 965, 10 A. D.), VIII, 15716 (Büch. 966, 3d cent.); VI, 7872 and 23551 = X, 6620 (Büch. 971, 970, ca. Augustus); II, 391 (Büch. 485), VIII, 21032 (Büch. 486), XI, 5074 (Büch. 803, Antonines or later), VI, 30607^{2} (Büch. 1081); III, 13809 = 14217^{1} (Büch. 859, Viminacium, 3d cent.), 14165^{1}, Baalbek, late 3d cent.; VI, 3452 and 3608 (Büch. 475-6); VI, 6467 (Büch. 130, ca. 50 A. D.), IX, 4816 (Büch. 129, ca. 90 A. D.); Büch. 730 and ref.

81. C. I. L. V, 4656, 7047, 6842 (Büch. 1091-3), cf. 2986, frag. and VI, 30111 (Büch. 1094); VI, 11743 (Büch. 1498, ca. end 2d cent.) and Mélanges, vol. 25 (1905), p. 72 ff., cf. C. I. L. IX, 4756 (Büch. 409), XI, 6435 (Büch. 434); VI, 17056 (Büch. 1085, middle 1st cent.) and 19175 (Büch. 1086): V, 7404 and XI, 911 (Büch. 1180, 1181), see p. 234; Eph. Epigr. vol. 8, p. 380, no. 80, Illipula in Spain, 1st cent.?, and C. I. L. XI, 3963 (Büch. 591, Capena); X, 4428 and 5020 (Büch. 1083-4).

82. C. I. L. V. Suppl. It. 1305 (Büch. 1539), VI, 28523 (Büch. 1540), 30118 (Büch. 1541), Not. d. Scav. 1885, p. 496 (Büch. 1542). The last incorporates a *sententia* from VI, 7574 (Büch. 1490).

83. C. I. L. VI, 25617 and VIII, 15716, VI, 6467 and IX, 4816, as cited in 80. So De Rossi, Inscr. Christ. II, 1, pp. XXX-XXXI, thinks two Christian poems are copied from a longer one.

Another interesting example of a poem changed to suit a location is C. I. L. IX, 1817 (Büch. 1055), appearing also in X, 1152 (Büch. 1056).

84. As in C. I. L. III, 2382, 14184[9], after Caracalla, VI, 3604; III, 1926, VI, 18107 b, IX, 1826.

85. As in C. I. L. VI, 15106, 29580, IX, 2437, Chr., 553 A. D., XI, 1057, 1800, Chr., 4th cent.; Bull. Crist. vol. 2 (1864), p. 34, Chr., 4th cent.

86. As in C. I. L. VI, 15696, IX, 1088, 3d cent., XI, 6417 and 6424, both from ancient Pisaurum.

87. On this general subject see Fr. Vollmer, Laudationum funebrium Romanarum historia et reliquiarum editio, Jahr. Class. Phil. Suppl. 18 (1892), pp. 445-528[6]. Cf. an article by the same author, De funere publico Romanorum, Jahr. Class. Phil. Suppl. 19 (1893), pp. 319-364.

88. As in C. I. L. III, 3355, 3d cent., VI, 2960, 8467, Titus, 9792, beg. 3d cent., 25855, XIII, 1897, ca. 2d cent., 3720, XIV, 2485.

89. See also C. I. L. VI, 7652, 20905 a, 27458; cf. 15454 and the late Christian examples, X, 761, 4539, Nuovo Bull. Crist., vol. 15 (1909), pp. 141-3.

90. See also C. I. L. III, 13124, 426 or 430 A. D., V, 5415, 6th cent., VI, 9274, X, 1971, 3030, 4053, XI, 330, after 6th cent.

91. As in C. I. L. V, 7465, 180 A. D., VI, 4870, 8534 b, 10558, 1st cent.?, 25512, XIII, 1972, 3d cent.; VI, 18659 is similar, though not personal.

92. C. I. L. II, 1276, III, 707, 7526, 14493, V, 4440, 4488, Constantine, 7454, VI, 9626, VIII, 18629, IX, 1670, XI, 2596, XII, 1657, 3861; Not. d. Scav. 1899, p. 148, Sulmona.

93. See also C. I. L. I, 1049 = VI, 16606, ca. 100 B. C., VI, 1819, 25175, 25987, 35793, end Rep., XIII, 8486, Christian.

94. See also C. I. L. II, 3181, V, 5933, VI, 27365, 29129, XIII, 1983, 3d cent.; Jahresh. des Oesterr. Arch. Inst. Beiblatt, vol. 9 (1906), pp. 17-18, Grado, 5th cent. Christian.

95. See also C. I. L. III, 7584, V, 5701, VI, 9460, 10213, ref. to Sejanus, 11252, 3d-4th cent., 16803, ca. end 2d cent.

96. See also C. I. L. VI, 11252, 3d-4th cent., VIII, 79, 868, 5749 = 19146, 10927, Chr., 360 A. D., X, 777, XII, 5193, XIII, 3448, Chr.

97. See also C. I. L. VIII, 15569 (Büch. 525, late), XIV, 3415 (Büch. 746, 4th-5th cent.); Inscr. Christ. I, 464 (Büch. 678, 398 A. D.), II, 1, p. 83, no. 23 (Büch. 1382, 555 A. D.), p. 104, no. 38, p. 130, no. 15, 523 A. D.; Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 32 (1898), p. 459, no. 37, Africa.

98. As in C. I. L. III, 4487 = 11095 (Büch. 1121), VIII, 9473 (Büch. 1153), X, 7426 (Büch. 1315); cf. also VI, 18149 (Büch. 1217).

99. As in C. I. L. VI, 6986 (Büch. 1034, Antonines), 12307 (Büch. 1050, end 1st cent.), 16709 (Büch. 178), IX, 1921 (Büch. 1487), X, 5495 (Büch. 376), XI, 5784 (Büch. 1794).

100. Others of these elaborate productions are: C. I. L. III, 686 (Büch. 1233, 3d cent.), 754 = 7436 (Büch. 492, 2d cent.), 3397 (Büch. 555, 4th cent.?), VI, 6976 (Büch. 1033, Antonines), 9118 (Büch. 467), 9693 (Büch. 1136), 10226 (Büch. 1119, 1st cent.), 18385 (Büch. 1184, Ant. Pius), 19175 (Büch. 1086), 20674 (Büch. 436), 21521 (Büch. 1109, Flavians), 22377 (Büch. 1040), 24520 (Büch. 1057, 'fine letters'), 25063 (Büch. 1549), VIII, 11597 (Büch. 1515), 12792 (Büch. 1187, end 1st-beg. 2d cent.), IX, 3279 (Büch. 1183), X, 2496 (Büch. 613), 4041 (Büch. 1075), XI, 3771 (Büch. 430), 4631 (Büch. 1846), 6080 (Büch. 1823), XII, 861 (Büch. 1192, 2d cent., see p. 284), XIII, 7813 (Büch. 794), 8371, 3d cent.; Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 68, no. 30 (Büch. 1404), p. 93, no. 65 (Büch. 1403); Rev. Arch. Fourth Series, vol. 11 (1908), p. 320, no. 15, Ammaedara.

101. As C. I. L. V, 4593 (Büch. 1042), XI, 5927 (Büch. 1102), 6551 (Büch. 1088); II, 1504 (Büch. 1138), V, 5824 (Büch. 537), VI, 15546 (Büch. 493); VI, 7886 (Büch. 1143, ca. Domitian); VI, 19049 (Büch. 545), 23295 (Büch. 393); V, 5961 (Büch. 639, frag.), XIII, 7113 (Büch. 216).

102. As C. I. L. VI, 8401 (Büch. 1388, 578 A. D.), 31937-8 (Büch. 707, 534 A. D.), 32031 (Büch. 1370, 525 A. D.), 32038 (Büch. 1375, 533 A. D.), XIII, 2352, 472 A. D.; Inscr. Christ. I, 329 (Büch. 670, 383 A. D.), 677 (Büch. 708, 539 A. D.), II, 1, p. 83, no. 23 (Büch. 1382,

555 A. D.), p. 87, no. 31 (Büch. 737, cf. Bull. Crist. Third Series, vol. 6 (1881), p. 16), p. 106, no. 50 (Büch. 1431), p. 130, no. 15, 523 A. D.; Inscr. Hisp. Christ. 34 a (Büch. 1380, 549 A. D.); Bull. Crist., vol. 1 (1863), p. 43, 418-420 A. D.

103. See also C. I. L. VI, 32014 (Büch. 1373, 530-3 A. D.), X, 1338 (Büch. 661, 359 A. D.), 4494 (Büch. 1360, 489 A. D.), XII, 5350 (Büch. 1443, 5th-6th cent.); Inscr. Christ. I, 479 (Büch. 679, 399 A. D.), 1179 (Büch. 1401, after middle 6th cent.), II, 1, p. 104, no. 42 (Damasus to his sister), p. 115, no. 85 (Büch. 1408), p. 118, no. 103 (Büch. 755).

104. See also C. I. L. III, 3576 (Büch. 620), 6380 (Büch. 1267), 6744 (Büch. 418), 8160 (Büch. 566), V, 6811 (Büch. 137), VI, 7873 (Büch. 1022, Augustan), 9449 (Büch. 994, Aug.-Tib.), 10078 = 33940 (Büch. 399), 11434 (Büch. 1022), 12056 (Büch. 1026), 21674 (commatic, Büch. 1579), 22513 (Büch. 1269, ca. Augustus?), 28228 (Büch. 1054, Aug.-Tib.?), 28661 (Büch. 1792), VIII, 3506 (Büch. 1236), 11613 (Büch. 1284), IX, 2991 (Büch. 642), 3622 (Büch. 381), X, 4917 (Büch. 1015), 5106 (Büch. 384); Comptes-Rendus, 1908, p. 496, Narbonne.

105. See C. I. L. I, 1194 = X, 6009 (Büch. 56, ca. Caesar), VI, 1372 (Büch. 426, beg. 2d cent.), 1417 (Büch. 106, ca. 271 A. D.), 1692 (Büch. 892 ca. 352 A. D.; cf. 1693, Büch. 325), 31711 (Büch. 1306).

106. A fairly complete list is: C. I. L. II, 1399 (Büch. 1140), III, 423 (Büch. 1168), 3572 (Büch. 558, 3d cent.), 3676 (Büch. 427, Hadrian), 6384 (Büch. 1206), 9106 (Büch. 1156), V, 938 (Büch. 372), 1071 (Büch. 66), 2931 (Büch. 996, Tiberius), VI, 5254 (Büch. 86, Tiberius), 5534 (Büch. 1035), 5953 (Büch. 1068, Tiberius?), 6593 (Büch. 1030, Aug.-Tib.), 7578 (Büch. 422, 126 A. D.), 7872 (Büch. 971, Augustus; note interpolated verses), 7898 (Büch. 1058), 8012 (Büch. 134, Tiberius), 8991 (Büch. 101, Hadrian), 9199 a (Büch. 1080), 9447 (Büch. 1012), 9604 (Büch. 1253, mid. 2d cent.), 9632 = 33813 (Büch. 89), 9797 (Büch. 29, 126 A. D.), 10006 (Büch. 1133), 12087 (Büch. 611), 12845 (Büch. 387), 13481

(Büch. 463), 14211 (Büch. 964, Caesar?), 16913 (Büch. 1185, Ant. Pius), 17106 (Büch. 1250), 17130 (Buch. 963, 12 B. C.), 19331 (Büch. 421), 19747 (Büch. 987, bef. 31-2 A. D.), 22251 (Büch. 1127, 1st cent.?), 22321 (Büch. 1220), 23135 (Büch. 1132), 25871 (Büch. 1219), 26544 (Büch. 1820), 27060 (Büch. 1161), 27852 (Büch. 1225), 28877 (Büch. 1036, 1st cent.), 29609 (Büch. 974), 33087 (commatic, Büch. 1563, Caesar), 33316 (Büch. 967, Augustan), 33395, 33903 (Büch. 1249), 35126, VIII, 7228 (Büch. 561), 7604 (commatic, Büch. 1613), 11824 (Büch. 1238, 3d cent.), 15987 (Büch. 1240), 16159 (Büch. 1554), 16463 (Büch. 514), 16566 (Büch. 1332), IX, 175 (commatic, Büch. 1572), 1880 (Büch. 100), 3122 (Büch. 1213), 4744 (Büch. 1211), 4756 = XI, 1488 (Büch. 409), 6417 (Büch. 1131), X, 5429 (Büch. 1144), XI, 117 (Büch. 102), 137 (commatic, Büch. 1580, Claudius), 531 (Büch. 1170), 654 (Büch. 491), 5836 (Büch. 1252), 6606 (Büch. 386), XIII, 2313 (Büch. 1277), 6823 (Büch. 407), 7105 (Büch. 1116), XIV, 316 (Büch. 1105), 510 (Büch. 1186, Ant. Pius?), 914 (Büch. 1318), 2298 (Büch. 990, 12-22 A. D., praise of patron Cotta by dead), 2553 (Büch. 1032, 1st cent.); Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 31 (1897), p. 147, no. 43, Carthage; Not. d. Scav. 1892, p. 190 (Büch. 646, Sardinia), 1898, p. 477, no. 14, Bologna, no name, 1900, p. 578, no. 35, Rome; A. J. A. Second Series, vol. 2 (1898), p. 396, no. 60, commatic, Cumae.

107. Besides others noted in following notes, see also C. I. L. II, 59 (Büch. 1553), 3256 (Büch. 1196, 1st cent.), 5907 (Büch. 1193, 2d cent.), III, 4483 (Büch. 1082, 6-63 or 80-98 A. D., stereotyped), 9733 (Büch. 77, 1st cent.), VI, 3608 (Büch. 475), 14578 = 34083 (Büch. 502), 21200 Büch. 973, Augustus?), 25703 (Büch. 1537), VIII, 1027 = 12468 (Büch. 484, end 2d cent. or later), 20808 (Büch. 1830, 305 A. D.), 21179 (Büch. 429, 1st cent.?), IX, 60 (Büch. 1533, 1st cent.), 1764 (Büch. 76), 2128 (Büch. 83), 3071 (Büch. 1212), 3358 (Büch. 1125), XI, 6125 (Büch. 986).

108. Die Grabscrift des Dichters Pacuvius und des L. Maecius Philotimus, in Arch. Epigr. Mitth. vol. 17 (1894),

pp. 227-239. The discussions of Teuffel, *op. cit.* p. 169, and Bücheler, note on 53, were both written before this inscription was discovered.

109. As in C. I. L. II, 1088 (Büch. 541, beg. 3d cent.), 3475 (Büch. 980), III, 6416 (Büch. 82, bef. 42 A. D.), 9314 (Büch. 1205), VI, 7419 (Büch. 1016, Aug.-Tib.), 10097 (Büch. 1111, date variously given as Claudius, Flavians, Trajan), 10098 (Büch. 1110), 10493 (Büch. 1122, mid. 2d cent.), 10969 (Büch. 443), 29629 (Büch. 1067), 36202 (Büch. 1545), VIII, 9642 (commatic, Büch. 1603), 13134 (do., Büch. 1606, Hadrian-Ant. Pius), 21008 (cf. Büch. 1539-42), IX, 1527 (Büch. 73, 'ancient letters'), 1817 (Büch. 1055, cf. 1056), 4796 (Büch. 437), 4810 (Büch. 1305), X, 1152 (Büch. 1056, cf. 1055), 2311 (Büch. 420), 4915 (Büch. 1319), XI, 627 (Büch. 513), 6435 (Büch. 434), XII, 218 (Büch. 466), 533 Büch. 465, end 2d cent.), XIII, 2219 (Büch. 1198), 7070 (Büch. 1007, beg. 1st cent.), 7234 (Büch. 1005, 43 A. D.), 8355 Büch. 219), XIV, 2605 (Büch. 477).

110. As in C. I. L. II, 391 (Büch. 485), 1235 (Büch. 1316), 1821 (commatic, Büch. 1566, ca. Augustus), 4314 (Büch. 1279), III, 6475 = 10762 (Büch. 1310), V, 6128 (Büch. 473), VI, 1951 (Büch. 1256), 3452 (Büch. 476, cf. VI, 3608), 10627 (Büch. 109, mid. 2d cent.), 17985 a (Büch. 856, advice at end), 19007 (Büch. 562), 19683 (commatic, Büch. 1582, advice at end), 20370 = 34130 (Büch. 1544, Augustan), 23629 (Büch. 496, mid. 2d cent.), 26680 (Büch. 1173), 27140 (Büch. 1163), 35887 (Büch. 1532, cf. 29609), VIII, 1523 = 15539 (Büch. 1237, mid. 2d cent.), 7156 (Büch. 512, end 4th cent.), 21031 (Büch. 479), IX, 1164 (Büch. 97, end 1st cent.), 2272 (Büch. 1523, Hadrian-Antonines), 3473 (Büch. 186, late), 3895 (Büch. 90), 4922 (Büch. 62), X, 2503 (Büch. 1231, advice at end), 8131 (Büch. 428, Hadrian), XI, 1122 (Büch. 1273, advice at end), 1616 (Büch. 1190), 4311 (Büch. 457), XIV, 480 (Büch. 1255); Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 94, no. 67, 5th-6th cent.; Not. d. Scav. 1894, p. 144 (Büch. 857, Rome); Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 33 (1898), p. 337, Carthage.

111. See also C. I. L. VI, 31934, beg. 5th cent.?, XI, 466 (Büch. 505), XIII, 5657, 461 A. D.?, 482 A. D.?; Inscr. Christ. I, 882 (Büch. 693, 483 A. D.), II, 1, p. 107, no. 55 (Büch. 1354, 440-461 A. D.), p. 126, no. IIII, 498 A. D., p. 169, no. 24 (Büch. 1562); Inscr. Hisp. Christ. 12 (Büch. 718, 593 A. D.); Bull. Crist. vol. 2 (1864), p. 33 (Büch. 1423, ca. 5th cent.).

112. See also C. I. L. III, 9623 (Büch. 627), XI, 4164 (Büch. 713, 558 A. D.), XIII, 2414, 5th-6th cent.; Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 92, no. 57 (Büch. 673, Damasan), p. 273, no. 3 (Büch. 756); Bull. Crist. vol. 2 (1864), p. 55 (Büch. 761, beg. 4th cent.).

113. C. I. L. II, 562 (Kaibel, Ep. 704, Büch. 1197, Antonines, Gk. only personal), III, 423 (Kaibel, Ep. 298, Büch. 1168), VI, 6225 (Kaibel, Ep. 697 a, Büch. 811, beg. 1st cent.), 10971 (Kaibel, Ep. 680, Büch. 442, Gk. only personal), 14672 (Kaibel, Ep. 646, dated by him 3d-4th cent., by Huebner, Vesp.-Comm.), 16843 (Kaibel, Ep. 616, 2d cent.), 18175 (Kaibel, Ep. 619, ca. 2d cent.), 18487 (Kaibel, Ep. 556, 1st-2d cent.), 19954 (Kaibel, Ep. 572, 1st-2d cent.), 20548 (Kaibel, I. G. I. 1703, Titus), 26251 (Kaibel, Ep. 646 a), 32316 (Kaibel, Ep. 589), X, 1494 (Kaibel, Ep. 563, ca. 2d cent.), 1497 (Kaibel, Ep. 502, 2d cent.).

C. I. L. VI, 24042 (Kaibel, Ep. 551, 2d-3d cent.) is addressed to the dead.

114. As C. I. L. II, 558 (Büch. 1451), 5975 (Büch. 1457, 1st cent.), VI, 12951 (Büch. 1456), VIII, 13265 (Büch. 135); Not. d. Scav. 1889, p. 112 (Büch. 1463); Büch. 1458, cf. Ovid, Her. 7, 162; cf. C. I. L. VI, 24022, frag.

115. See also C. I. L. I, 1431 = V, 4111 (Büch. 119, late Rep.), III, 293 (Büch. 243, beg. Empire), 9302 (commatic, Büch. 1588, 2d cent.), V, 3403 (Büch. 1004, stereotyped), 4078 (Büch. 84), VI, 14618 (Büch. 1494), X, 5371 (Büch. 118), XI, 856 (Büch. 191).

116. See also C. I. L. V, 3415 (Büch. 1095), 5278 (Büch. 1274), VI, 6821 (Büch. 375, Augustus), 7193 a (Büch. 1247), 18209 (Büch. 1077), IX, 952 (Büch. 1340, 'best letters'), 2114 (Büch. 187, after Augustus), 4840

(Büch. 1496), XI, 207 (Büch. 507), XII, 5102 (Büch. 188, ca. Augustus).

117. See also C. I. L. I, 1019 = VI, 30105 (Büch. 68, late Rep.), III, 14850, VI, 1779 (Büch. 111, 384-5 A. D.), 19175 (Büch. 1086), VIII, 7255 (Büch. 560), XI, 1209 (Büch. 1550, Hadrian); Bull. Crist. Fourth Series, vol. 3 (1884-5), p. 72 ff. (Büch. 730); see Nuovo Bull. Crist. vol. 6 (1900), p. 339 ff.

118. See Büch. 108-9, Rome, 301, do., Chr., 436, Rome, 437, 661, Chr., 359 A. D., 669, Rome, Chr., 382 A. D., 676, do., 395 A. D., 708, do., 539 A. D., 744, Rome, Chr., 1550 B, ca. Hadrian, 1613-5, Africa, 1829, do., 1830, do., 315 A. D.; Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 32 (1898), p. 459, no. 37, Africa.

119. See also C. I. L. II, 391 (Büch. 485), VIII, 1027 (Büch. 484), 1359 (Büch. 521), XII, 861 (Büch. 1192, 2d cent., pt. stereotyped), 5811? (Büch. 1191, do.), XIV, 2605 (Büch. 477); so those of Damasus, as Inscr. Christ. I, 329 (Büch. 670); Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 83, no. 23 (Büch. 1382, 555 A. D.), p. 130, no. 15, 523 A. D.; Rev. Arch. Third Series, vol. 32 (1898), p. 459, no. 37, Africa; Büch. 1829, do.

120. C. I. L. V, 5278? (Büch. 1274), VI, 9447 (Büch. 1012), 9449 (Büch. 994), 9752 (Büch. 1555), 10097 (Büch. 1111), 13528 (Büch. 1559), 16843? (Kaibel, Ep. 616), 33904? (Büch. 1251, Severus-Gordian), 33976 (Kaibel, Ep. 618, Sulpicius), IX, 1164 (Büch. 97), XIII, 8355 (Büch. 219); Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 126, no. IIII?; probably C. I. L. VI, 1779 (Büch. 111), 21521 (Büch. 1109), VIII, 212-3 (Büch. 1552). XIII, 2352 was written by Sidonius Apollinaris for his grandfather's tomb (Ep. 3, 12).

121. C. I. L. II, 5063, statue, VI, 2273, buildings, etc., 8513, rebuilding monument, beg. 3d cent., VIII, 8209 = 19328, private buildings, 9585 = 20958 (Büch. 115, Chr., 3d cent.), 12035, towers, Chr., 590-600 A. D., X, 6656, baths at Antium, 379-382 A. D., XIV, 324, permit, 203 A. D., 4012, construction of road; Inscr. Christ. II, 1, p. 151, no. 23, roof, etc., Damasan, p. 449, no. 215, doorway.

122. See Peter, I, p. 453, Fairley, U. of P. Trans. and Repr. vol. V, no. 1 (1898); but cf. Schanz, Geschichte der röm. Lit., in Müller, vol. VIII, ii, 1 (1899), pp. 10-13, Misch, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

123. As Nos. III, 52 A. D.?, VI, 54 A. D., XVI, 55 A. D., XX, XXI and XXIII, 56 A. D., XXVIII, XXXII, and XXXIII, 57 A. D., XLV, uncertain, CXXXVIII, 53 A. D., CXXXIX, uncertain, CXLI and CXLII, 58 A. D., CXLIII, 59 A. D., CXLIV, 60 A. D., CXLV and CXLVI, 58 A. D., CXLVII, 59 A. D., CLI, 62 A. D.

124. As Nos. VII, 54 A. D., XVII, 55 A. D., XXII, XXIV, XXV and XXVII, 56 A. D., XXX, XXXV and XL, 57 A. D., XLVI, 56 A. D. On these forms see C. I. L. IV, p. 421.

125. As C. I. L. VII, 1336[272, 483a, b, c, 504], VIII, 22645[222], Gallic, XII, 5686[718, 831], XIII, 10009[160], 10010[10e, 79b, 702s[1], 921, 1094o, 1280c, g[1], 1300b[1], 1336i, 1355, 1422c, 1744c[1], 1921z[2], 2522, 3167t, 3310i], XV, 5309 a, Arretine.

Perhaps the same with *te* occurs on Cales ware and other archaic clay objects: C. I. L. XI, 6703[4a, c] = X, 8054[7a, c], 6709[3], clay pyramid.

126. C. I. L. XV, 7172-4, 7176, 7178-9, 7180, 7181, 379-381 A. D., 7182-9, 7190, 4th-beg. 5th cent., 7191, 7192, 1st inscr. ca. Constantine, 2nd, mid.-end 4th cent., 7193-8, 7199, ca. 369-379 A. D. See references there; add Nuovo Bull. Crist. vol. 8 (1902), p. 126, Rev. Arch. Fourth Series, vol. 8 (1906), p. 479, no. 148, Bulla Regia.

127. See also C. I. L. III, 30, 65 A. D., 31, 71-2 A. D., 32, 72 A. D., 33, 79 A. D., 34, 80-81 A. D., 35, 82 A. D., 42, 127 A. D., 44, 134 A. D., 46, 136 A. D., 49, 170 A. D., 50, 195 A. D.?, 51, 196 A. D., 54, 56, 57 and 58, end 1st cent., 59 and 60, end 1st cent. or Trajan, 61-64, uncertain.

128. C. I. L. III, 67, Thebes, 168 A. D., 70, 71 and 72, Thebes, 74, Philae, 2 B. C., 13582, Talmis 102-117 A. D.; Rev. Arch. Fourth Series, vol. 11 (1908), p. 323, no. 28, Esneh.

129. See also C. I. L. VI, 3008, Alex. Severus, 3010, 3041, 3056, 228 A. D., 3057, 219 A. D., 3060, 3072 (quotation), 3075, 229 A. D., 3087, Gordian; Eph. Epigr. vol. 7, p. 368, no. 1217, Alex. Severus.

130. As C. I. L. III, 80, 12067, Domitian, IV, 1593 (metrical?), 1607, 1684, 1819, 1839, 1852 (metrical?), 1911, 1951, 1991, 2015, 2413f, 2414, 3013, 5094.

131. See also C. I. L. IV, 1234 (Büch. 232, no name), 1824, 4200 (Büch. 947), 1877 (Büch. 42), 1928 (Büch. 937), 4966 (Büch. 934), 5092 (Büch. 44).

INDEX

See also the word lists on pp. 157ff., 213f.

Abstract substantives in *sermo vulgaris*, 114, 124ff.; in classical prose, 114.
Abstract technical terms, 119, 126f.
—— in *-tura*, 126, 128, 144ff., 153f.; in *-tio*, 118, 126f.
Adjective, substantivized, bibliography of, 180ff. See also Substantivized adjective.
Adj. subst., true, 206; *quasi* adj. sub., 208; positional adj. s., 209.
Adverbial usage of *idem*, 95, 97ff.
ain (Armenian), 22f.
án (Old Engl.), 18f.
Anaphoric use of *idem*, 62.
ánlík (Old Engl.), 26.
Archaisms, 116f.
Augustus noster, 219.
Autobiographic elements, definition of, 216; in dedications, 227; in *devotiones*, 229; in epitaphs, 230; in honorary inscriptions, 261; in autobiographic records, 261; in business documents, 263; in inscr. on small objects, 263; in *graffiti*, 264f.
— —, panegyrical, 228; eulogistic, 242, 250, 252, 253.
Autobiographic expressions, local types of, 224, 231, 236, 237.
Autobiographic formulæ, 235; of legal character, 237.
—— origin of poetic, 240ff.
Autobiographic inscriptions: earliest, 262; comparative frequency of prose and poetry in, 226; geographical distribution of, 223; poetical, authorship of, 228, 259; religious influence on, 230, 267; dialog in, 257, 266; acrostic, 258; of pet dogs, 258.
— — social rank of their authors: senators and *equites*, 224; *milites*, 225; plebeians, 225; *praetor*, 225; slaves, 226.
Autobiographic narrative, types and chronology of, 252ff.
"Autobiographic records," 261.
αὐτός, 45ff.; 54f.; *αὐτό τοῦτο*, 48;
Mod. Gk. *αὐτός*, 50.

St. Balthildis *Vitae*, usage of pronouns in, 94.

Caesar, De Bello Gallico, 5, 16, 3. See p. 88.
Caesar noster, 219.
centos, 257.
Christian epitaphs, 218, 221, 224, 226 *et passim*, 255, 261, 263.
Cicero, De div. 2, 95..... 43
In Verr. 1, 71..... 42
Post red. in sen. 33..... 42
Pro lege Man. 46.....42, 44
Pro Murenar 21 88
Orator, 235 42
Tusc. disp. 1, 40; 5, 26.. 42, 44
Letters, Latinity of, 125, 151.
Apologizes for words in *-tio*, *-tudo*, *-tas*, *-ntia*, *-ia*, *-ium*, *cula*, *-ola*, *-tus*, 127.

Comparison, subjective element in, 11f.
consimilis, 36, 61.
continuum defined, 7; illustrated, 36.

Dedicatory poems, 228.
Demonstrative pronouns, general function of, 51; see also *is*, *ille*, etc.
Der- demonstration, 23ff., 44, 46f., 49.
derselbe, 67f., 84.
Determinative pronouns, 62ff., 90, 92.
devotiones, 229.
Dialects, Latin, 115.
dominus, its meaning in 2d cent. A. D., 219; *dominus noster*, 219.

ein und derselbe, 21f.
eka (skr.) expressing identity, 19; *ekasamāna*, 33.
Ellipsis, 182f., 202ff.
em em (Latin), 28.
enam (Skr.), 22.
Equality, 6.
esa (Spanish) and *essa* (Portuguese), 49.
eva (Skr.), 25.

fera, 205, 208.
Foreign influence on Roman vocabulary, 120.

graffiti, autobiographic, 264ff.

hic, relative frequency in the use of its various forms, 95; *hic* as a determinative, 90, 92f.; *hic ipse*, 41, 53, 85, 97; *haec eadem ipsa*, 44.

ἰα and *ἰός*, meaning of, 26.
ibidem = *ibi*, 73.
idem: "adverbial," 70f., 95, 97ff.; ambiguous, 17, 81, 94; anaphoric, 62ff.; derivation of, 28, 66f.; development of meaning of, 44, 68f., 95f.; original meaning of, 66; frequency of its employment, 63, 66; previous studies of *idem*, 62ff.; *idem* as a determinative, 62ff., 93; as a non-dominating element, 82f., 98; *idem* = *is*, 62ff.; *idem* = *item*, 73, 95f.; *idem* confused with *id est*, 102; *idem* in Ammianus, 77f.; in Justin, 77ff.; in Script. Hist. Aug., 79; in headings and titles, 73; *idem*, obsolete 93; *idem ipse*, 41f., 53, 85f.; *idem* meaning 'he, she, it,' 62f.; *unum et idem*, 20f., 43; *idem unum*, 59; *is idem*, 79; *qui idem*, 96f.; *idem* in Vitae S. Balthildis, 94; in Libellus de Constantino Magno, 64; in Boethius, 65; *hic idem*, 44, 78; *idem ille* and *idem iste*, 78.
idemque = *idem*, 103.
Identity, definition of, 3; forms of, 10.
ille as a determinative, 90; *ille ipse*, 41.
imperator noster, 219.
īn (Mod. Persian), 22.
Inscriptions, autobiographic. See Autobiogr. Inscr.
ipse correlative, 40; expressing identity, 38f., 53; genesis of its meaning, 49ff., 92; analysis of its meaning, 38f.; pronunciation of, 49; reflexive usage, 54; frequency of the Nom. case, 94f.; *ipse atque idem*, 87; *iste ipse*, *hic ipse*, *idem ipse*, 41; *ipse ille*, 39; *ipse* as a determinative, 90; in Justin, 91; in Vitae S. Balthildis, 94; derivatives of *ipse* in Spanish, 50.
is, infrequent use of Nom. case, 94; extent of its usage in 2d to 4th cent. A. D., 62; prevalence of the

forms *eius* and *eorum*, 95; *id* replaced by *hoc*, 95; redundant *is*, 81; *is* in Vitae S. Balthildis, 94; *is idem*, 53, 79; *is ipse*, 41, 85, 97; *id est*, 102.
iste as a determinative pronoun, 90, 92f.
itemque = *item*, 103.
iura sepulchrorum, 236, 245f.

Justin, Praef. 4. See p. 73.

Latin dialects, 115.
laudationes, influence on inscriptions, 243.

Medical terms, poverty of the Latin in, 127.
molaris, meaning of, 183f.
Monumentum Ancyranum, 262.

Nonnius Datus *liberator*, 262.
Nonnus, Dion. 1, 336. See p. 35.
noster in pseudo-autobiographic inscriptions, 218f.
Noun, see Substantive.

odno i tožhe (Russian), 19.
* *oiwos* descendants of, 25.
οἶνη, 19.
* *oinos* descendants of, 19; 22ff.; "splitting" of its meaning, 23-25.
ὅμοιος, meanings of, 36.
ὁμόκλαρος, 35.
ὁμόκραιρος, 35.
ὁμός, 35.

Pacuvius, epigram on, 254.
Pagurius, epitaph of, 254.
par, derivation of, 61; usage of, 56f.; frequent in Ammianus, 59; *par et (atque) idem*, 87f.; *par idem*, 87; *par atque unum*, 89; *pari modo*, ratione, sorte, 59, 89.
παρὰ, meaning in compounds, 61.
παρόμοιος, 61.
Partial identity, 5-10.
Participles as substantives, 201ff.
Petronius, vocabulary of, 152f.
Philotimus, epitaph of, 254.
Pindar, Ol. 2, 89 (ὁμός). See p. 35. Nem. 9, 11 (ὁμός). See p. 35.
Plautus, vocabulary of, 119.
Plautus and Terence, vocabulary of, compared, 154f.
podobnyi (Russian), 37.
Popilius, P., autobiography of, 262.
princeps noster, 219.
Pronouns, bibliography of, 105ff.
——, personal, in pseudo-autobiographic inscriptions, 216-221.
——, demonstrative, chronology of their changes in meaning, 90ff.
Pseudo-autobiographic inscriptions, 216-222.
publicus, 187f.

quandoque = *quando*, 103.

Rustic Latin vocabulary, 126.

Salonae, autobiographical inscr. from, 261.
sama (Gothic), 33.
samāna (Skr.), 33.
samás (Skr.), 32f.
same, the (Engl.), anaphoric, 83f.
Scientific technical terms, 118f., 126f., 146.
Scipio, epitaph of, 252, 259.
Sententiae and inscriptions, 260, 266.
se sylfa, 53f.
se ylca, 54.
selb (Germanic), derivation of, 48.
* *sem*, * *som*, etc., descendants of, 29ff.
semel, 30.
semper, 30.

sermo cotidianus, 124f., 128, etc.
serpens (*bestia*), 206f.
Similarity defined, 9.
Similis, 17, 31.
simplus, *simplex*, 30.
simul, 31.
sincinio, *singilio*, *singuli*, 30.
Statistics, value of, 64.
Stone cutters' methods, 241.
Substantives, abstract, not characteristic of the popular speech, 113; not characteristic of certain trades, 126; concrete s., 152.
—— in *-edo*, 149; in *-ela*, 149; in *-ia*, 177; in *-ido*, 149; in *-io*, 157; in *-itia* and *-ities*, 150f., 175ff.; in *-ium*, 177f.; in *-monia* and *-monium*, 148f.; in *-ntia*, 123, 134f. (not characteristic of plebeian language), 160ff.; in *-or*, 128f., 129 (in Lucretius), 162f.; in *-tas*, 131, 163f.; in *-tas* and *-tudo* compared, 132; in *-tio*, 138ff., 165-172, 128 (in Caesar, Cato, Livy, Sallust, Varro), 141 (in Cicero), 126 (in rustic Latin—see also p. 141); in *-tio* and *-tus* compared, 132, 138ff., 157ff.; in *-tor*, 121, 123 (in inscriptions); in *-tudo*, 130, 133 (in the *sermo cotidianus*), 158, 162f.; in *-tudo* and *-or* compared, 130; in *-tudo* and *-tas* compared, 132; in *-tura* 126, 146 (not characteristic of the *sermo rusticus*), 154ff., 174f., 177; in *-tura* and *-tio* compared, 145; in *-tus*, 142f., 172-174.
—— in Petronius, list of, 177f.
—— Plautine, 116f. (in *tudo* and *-tas* compared), 117f. (in *-tus*), 118f. (in *-tio*), 121 (in *-tor*).
Substantivized adjective, 180ff.; feminine gender, 200; summary of Lucretian usage, 214.
Substantivizing of adjectives, nature of the process, 185f.
sups (Old Prussian), 55.
sylfa (Old Engl.), 53.

Terence and Plautus, vocabulary of, compared, 154f.
totidem = *tot*, 73.

unus expressing identity, 16; distinguished from *idem*, 15; usage of, 12ff.; with demonstrative meaning, 23; *unus et idem*, 20f.; *unus omnium* and *unus* with superlative, 23; *una mente*, *una voce*, 13, 14; *unum sentire* and *idem sentire*, 14f.

Valerius Maximus, 1, 1, 5 (*idem*). See p. 80.
Vitruvius vocabulary of technical rather than vulgar, 144f., 153.
Vulgar Latin, its relation to literary Latin, 113f.
Vulgate translation of New Testament, vocabulary of, 119.

Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities

EDITED BY PERCY GARDNER, University of Oxford, and
FRANCIS W. KELSEY, University of Michigan

FOWLER

The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic. By W. WARDE FOWLER. *$1.25 net*

FROTHINGHAM

The Monuments of Christian Rome. From Constantine to the Renaissance. By ARTHUR L. FROTHINGHAM, Ph. D. *$2.25 net.*

GARDNER, E. A.

Greek Sculpture. By ERNEST A. GARDNER. Two parts in one volume, with appendix. *$2.50 net*

Appendix to the above, separately. *$.35 net*

GARDNER, P.

Grammar of Greek Art. By PERCY GARDNER. *$1.75 net*

GREENIDGE

A Handbook of Greek Constitutional History. By A. H. J. GREENIDGE. With map. *$1.25 net*

Roman Public Life. By A. H. J. GREENIDGE. *$2.50 net*

HILL

Greek and Roman Coins. By GEORGE F. HILL, of the Coins Department. British Museum. *$2.25 net*

LANCIANI

The Destruction of Ancient Rome. A sketch of the history of the monuments. By RODOLFO LANCIANI. *$1.50 net*

LOWRIE

Monuments of the Early Church. By W. LOWRIE. *$1.25 net*

MARQUAND

Greek Architecture. By ALLAN MARQUAND. *$2.25 net*

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Sixty-four and Sixty-six Fifth Avenue, New York

By W. WARDE FOWLER

Author of "The City State of the Greeks and Romans," "The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic," etc.

Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero

Cloth, 8vo, $2.25 net, by mail $2.40

As the author points out in his preface there is no book in the English language which supplies a picture of life and manners, of education, morals, and religion in the intensely interesting period of the Roman Republic. The age of Cicero is one of the most important periods of Roman history, and the Ciceronian correspondence, of more than nine hundred contemporary letters, is the richest treasure-house of social life that has survived from any period of classical antiquity.

By SAMUEL DILL, M. A.

Hon. Litt. D., Dublin; Hon. LL. D., Edinburgh; Hon. Fellow and late Tutor C. C. C., Oxford; Professor of Greek in Queens College, Belfast.

Roman Society, from Nero to Marcus Aurelius

Second Edition, Cloth, 8vo, $2.50 net

and

Roman Society in the Last Century of the Western Empire

Second Edition, Cloth, 8vo, $1.75 net

"The most important contributions yet made in English to our knowledge of the way in which all classes of Roman society lived."—*The Sun*, New York.

By GEORGE W. BOTSFORD

Professor of Greek and Roman History at Columbia University.

The Roman Assemblies

Cloth, 8vo, $4.00 net

This work takes up the study of the development of popular government in ancient Rome, manifested through assemblies, in the light of comparative politics or sociology. Many problems are set forth in a clearer light than heretofore, and the volume will prove the most careful and judicious treatment of the subject available to students. As a living, first-hand study of popular government, it will attract not only classical scholars, but also those who are concerned with such problems as are raised by the interests of the United States in the Philippines.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Sixty-four and Sixty-six Fifth Avenue, New York